

HOUSING ELEMENT



ALAMEDA COUNTY
2015-2023
Adopted May 5, 2015

ALAMEDA COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY



This page has been intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	V
INTRODUCTION	IX
PURPOSE OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT	ix
HOUSING ELEMENT REQUIREMENTS	ix
REVIEW OF THE PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT	XI
CHANGES IN HOUSING ELEMENT LAW	xi
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	xi
PREVIOUS PLANNING EFFORTS	xii
CHAPTER I- HOUSING PLAN	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Provide Adequate Sites	2
Assist in the Development of Affordable Housing and Special Needs Housing	4
Address Governmental Constraints	12
Conserve and Improve the Existing Housing Stock	15
Preserve Units at Risk	19
Promote Equal Housing Opportunities	20
Environmental Sustainability	22
SUMMARY OF QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES	26
RESOURCES	26
Financial Resources	27
Administrative Resources	31
CHAPTER II- HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT	34
Introduction	34
Sources of Information	34
DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE GENERAL POPULATION	35
Current and Forecasted Population	35
Age Distribution	37
Race and Ethnicity	38
Educational Attainment	41
Group Quarters	41
GENERAL HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS	43
Households and Household Size	43

Housing Tenure	46
Income Characteristics	47
Self Sufficiency Standard	52
Employment Trends	53
Unemployment	59
HOUSING PROBLEMS	60
Cost Burden/Overpayment Above 30% of Income	61
Overcrowding	62
Physical Defects	63
SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING	65
Large Households	65
Single Parent Families	66
Persons with Disabilities	67
Elderly and Seniors	70
Homeless Persons and Families	72
Agricultural Workers	76
Extremely Low-Income Households	78
HOUSING STOCK	79
Total Housing Units	79
Multi-family vs. Single Family	79
Age of Housing Stock	81
Vacancy	82
HOUSING COST AND AFFORDABILITY	84
Homeownership Housing Costs	84
Rental Housing Costs	87
Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate	88
COST ANALYSIS OF PRESERVING “AT-RISK” PROJECTS	90
AVAILABLE RESOURCES FOR PRESERVATION	91
CHAPTER III- HOUSING CONSTRAINTS	92
GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS	92
Land Use Controls and Mitigations	93
General Plan	93
Specific Plans	94
Residential District Zoning	97
Evaluation of Zoning Standards	104
Proposed Zoning Code Update and the Alameda County Residential Standards and Guidelines	105
Growth Controls	105
Housing for Persons with Disabilities	106
Support for a Variety of Housing Types	108
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)	110
Fees and Exactions	110
Processing and Permit Procedures	115

Building Codes	123
Historic Preservation	123
Article 34	123
Septic Systems	124
ENVIRONMENTAL AND SAFETY CONSTRAINTS	125
Hillsides and Slopes	125
Creeks and Watercourses	125
Fire Hazards	126
Flooding and Mudflows	126
Seismic Hazards	127
Airport Influence Areas	128
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Requirements	128
Eastern Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS)	128
INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRAINTS	128
Water Supply	129
Sewer/ Wastewater Services	130
Streets	130
Education	131
Parks	131
NONGOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS	131
Housing Markets	131
Development Costs	136
Total Development Costs	137
ADDITIONAL CONSTRAINTS	139
Neighborhood Sentiment	139
Housing Discrimination	140
CHAPTER IV- SITES INVENTORY AND CAPACITY ANALYSIS	141
REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA)	141
Progress towards Meeting the RHNA Goals	142
Accommodating the Remaining RHNA Units	143
VACANT AND UNDERUTILIZED SITES ANALYSIS FOR MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL	144
Priority Development Areas	145
Methodology	146
Realistic Development Capacity	146
Small Sites	147
Non-Vacant and Underutilized Sites	150
Development Potential by Unincorporated Community	151
State Route 238 Study Area	151
ZONING APPROPRIATE TO ACCOMMODATE HOUSING FOR LOWER AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS	151
TRANSIT ORIENTED AND MIXED USE DISTRICTS	152

ADEQUACY OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES	152
ADEQUACY OF RESIDENTIAL SITES INVENTORY	152
CHAPTER V- OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION	154
The Relationship of the Housing Element to Regional Planning Efforts	154
County Planning Efforts	155
Title 24	156
Residential Rehabilitation Programs	156
Green Building and Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinances	156
CHAPTER VI- OTHER REQUIREMENTS	157
CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS AND OTHER PLANNING DOCUMENTS	157
NOTIFICATION OF WATER AND SEWER PROVIDERS	158
REVIEW OF CONSERVATION AND SAFETY ELEMENTS PER AB 162	158

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: SITES INVENTORY AND MAP
APPENDIX B: EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS ELEMENT
APPENDIX C: HOUSING PLAN SUMMARY
APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY
APPENDIX E: ACRONYMS
APPENDIX F: SOURCES
APPENDIX G: QUALIFIED ENTITIES
APPENDIX H: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS
APPENDIX I: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PREVIOUS ELEMENT
APPENDIX J: HOUSING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Alameda County Housing Element is the primary housing policy document for the unincorporated portions of the County and it provides a comprehensive strategy for promoting the development, preservation, and rehabilitation of safe, decent and affordable housing for all residents. The Housing Element of the General Plan is the only element in the Plan that must be updated on a specified schedule and that must be certified by the State. It is intended to be an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for housing in the County.

In accordance with California Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), which seeks to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the Housing Element is a key part of an integrated transportation and housing planning process coordinated through a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). SB 375 recognizes the importance of planning for housing and land use in creating sustainable communities where residents of all income levels have access to jobs, services, and housing using transit, or by walking and bicycling.

The Housing Element update covers the period from January 31, 2015 – January 31, 2023. Jurisdictions located within the region covered by the [Association of Bay Area Governments \(ABAG\)](#) are required to submit their adopted Housing Element to the HCD by July 31, 2015.

This Executive Summary presents the highlights of the Housing Element. The Housing Element includes an Introduction that provides an overview of the document's structure, purpose and statutory authority. The Introduction also describes how the State and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) assign specific targets for housing to individual jurisdictions throughout the state. Alameda County's allocation for the 2015-2023 period is 1,759 units, with nearly 63% of those units affordable to moderate and above moderate income households, and 37% affordable to extremely-low, very low and low income households.

HOUSING PLAN

The Housing Element includes an extensive set of goals, policies, and actions to ensure that the County has an adequate supply of decent, safe and affordable housing. The seven goals are listed here: for specific policies please consult the draft Element.

- Provide adequate sites, with appropriate zoning and development standards and services to accommodate the locality's share of the regional housing needs for each income level; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(1))
- Assist in the development of adequate and affordable housing to meet the needs of extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(2))
- Address, and where possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement and development of housing, including housing for all income levels and housing for persons with disabilities; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(3))
- Conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(4))
- Preserve assisted housing developments at-risk of conversion to market-rate; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(6)(d))

- Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status or disability; and (Government Code Section 65583(c)(5))
- Encourage building development that incorporates sustainable and energy efficient features (Government Code Section 65583(a)(7))

In order to promote housing for all economic levels and household types, the County uses a variety of planning and regulatory tools. While some of these tools are designed specifically to encourage affordable housing, others are intended to promote the development of housing for moderate and above-moderate income households. The 30 programs listed below contain a mix of financial and regulatory tools.

- | | |
|---|---|
| • Residential Sites Inventory | • Affordable Housing Trust Fund “Boomerang” Program |
| • Web Based Zoning and Planning Information | • Ordinance Review Committee |
| • Annual Progress Report | • Environmental Review Streamlining |
| • Affordable Housing Development | • Intergovernmental Coordination |
| • Density Bonus Program | • Minor Home Repair |
| • Small Lot Consolidation | • Accessibility Grants |
| • Secondary Units | • Rehabilitation Loans |
| • Park Fee Waiver | • Foreclosure Prevention |
| • HIV/AIDS Housing and Services | • Healthy Homes Department |
| • First Time Homebuyer Resources | • Code Enforcement |
| • Mortgage Credit Certificate | • Preservation of At Risk Housing |
| • Section 8 Housing Programs | • Condominium Conversion |
| • Family Self Sufficiency Program (FSS) | • Fair Housing Services |
| • Housing Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities | • StopWaste.org |
| • Housing Opportunities for the Homeless | • Infill, Mixed Use and Transit Oriented Developments |

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

As part of the Housing Element, the County prepared detailed Needs Assessment (Chapter 2) analyzing Alameda County’s demographics. The Needs Assessment identified a number of trends that informed the goals and policies of the updated Housing Element, including:

- The County’s population continues to grow, and will continue to do so through 2040.
- With the exceptions of Sunol and Fairview, all unincorporated neighborhoods had increases of more than 4% in household size, perhaps reflecting an increase in multi-generational households. By comparison, the change in the average household size of the entire County during that same time period was negligible.
- Alameda County is ethnically diverse, as of 2010, no single race or ethnic group made up the majority of residents in Unincorporated Alameda County.
- Alameda County’s population continues to grow older on average, with those aged 45-64 experiencing the greatest rates of growth.

- Unincorporated residents exceed the County average for home-ownership (60.8% vs. 53.4%).
- Extremely low-income residents (those earning 30% or less of median income) make up 12.3% of the total households in Unincorporated Alameda County, while very low- and low-income residents make up 11.5% and 15.6% of total households, respectively. Ashland and Cherryland have the greatest percentages of extremely low, very low and low income households, and Fairview has the lowest.
- Home prices have begun and continue to rise. Rents are generally unaffordable to lower-income households and are climbing.
- The Bay Area's economy is recovering rapidly and this, coupled with low inventories of available homes and interest rates at historic lows, is creating significant upward price pressures.

CONSTRAINTS

While the County has made extensive efforts to encourage development of affordable and market-rate housing, there are many governmental and non-governmental constraints that make housing development more difficult.

- Governmental constraints are typically rules that apply to all development that are intended to meet other community interests. Examples of such constraints in Alameda County include:
- Zoning and other land use controls such as height limitations, parking requirements, and open space standards;
- Fees and exactions that offset impacts on existing infrastructure like parks and roadways, but add to the cost of housing development; and
- Permit processes that ensure compliance with relevant codes but add time and cost to the cost of development.
- Non-governmental constraints include financial challenges such as availability of financing and the high cost of land in the Bay Area, as well as resistance to development of affordable housing from neighborhood residents ("Not In My Backyard" or NIMBYism).

A number of the goals and policies in the Housing Element are aimed at eliminating or lessening constraints to development of housing.

SITES INVENTORY AND CAPACITY ANALYSIS

A major component of the Housing Element is an analysis of sites that are available for the development of housing to meet the County's RHNA. Chapter 4 of the Housing Element identifies sites in Alameda County where zoning is in place to allow for housing development, including higher-density housing (30+ units per acre) that might be suitable for affordable housing development. The analysis shows that Alameda County has land available and zoning in place to meet the County's assigned share of regional housing between now and 2023.

OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION

Chapter 5 describes the ways in which the County supports efforts to conserve energy and natural

resources. The actions include the Community Climate Action Plan, Title 24 Compliance, and the Green Building and Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinances.

CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS AND OTHER PLANNING DOCUMENTS

State law requires the elements of the General Plan to be consistent. The Housing Element is consistent with all of the other elements of the General Plan, in that it does not require any changes to the other elements of the General Plan, modify or relocate density, or recommend policies or action programs that would create housing at the expense of goals and policies within the General Plan.

Upon adoption and certification of this Housing Element, the Alameda County will provide a copy of the Housing Element to the East Bay Municipal Water District, Zone 7 Water District and Oro Loma Sanitary District, pursuant to Government Code Section 65589.7.

Assembly Bill 162 (Wolk, 2007) requires that Alameda County review, and if necessary, identify new information for its Conservation and Safety Elements of its General Plan upon the next revision of the Housing Element, on or after January 1, 2009. An update of the Safety Element was completed in 2013, and amendments to the County's Conservation Element are in development.

INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT

The Alameda County Housing Element serves as a policy guide to address the comprehensive housing needs of the unincorporated areas of Alameda County. State Housing Element Law requires that local jurisdictions outline the housing needs in the community, the barriers or constraints to providing that housing, and actions proposed to address these concerns over a seven-year period. In addition, the State of California allocates, through local Councils of Government, each locality's "fair share housing needs" that the jurisdiction is to consider in the development of the Housing Element.

The provision of decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing for current and future residents of the unincorporated areas of Alameda County is the primary focus of the Housing Element. Additionally, the Housing Element places special emphasis on certain segments of the population, such as the elderly, the disabled, single-parent households, extremely low income and the homeless, as these groups may have more difficulty in finding decent and affordable housing due to their special needs.

The purpose of the Housing Element is to accomplish the following tasks:

- Determine the existing and projected housing needs of residents of the unincorporated areas;
- Identify adequate parcels via the site inventory process to facilitate the development of housing for various income levels;
- Establish goals and policies that guide decision-making to address housing needs; and
- Operate programs to implement the County's housing policies. These programs include activities to be undertaken by the County, as well as development activities to be undertaken by the private sector in the development of housing. One of the County's goals is to ensure that government policies do not serve as a constraint to housing production.

HOUSING ELEMENT REQUIREMENTS

The Alameda County Housing Element consists of five key components that fulfill the State's requirements. These sections are briefly described below.

Housing Plan and Quantified Objectives

The County must describe what current or proposed policies and actions will be taken to meet existing and projected housing needs, particularly for low and moderate income households as well as for the population with special needs. The element should address what policies the County has or will adopt to conserve, rehabilitate, and expand the supply of affordable housing. In addition, the County must estimate the maximum number of units, by income level, to be constructed, rehabilitated, and preserved over the planning period of the element.

Housing Needs Assessment

Each Housing Element must address the need for housing within its community. A study of the

existing housing needs within the community must include population, employment and income statistics; a review of overpayment and overcrowding statistics; information on extremely low income housing needs, and characteristics of the existing housing stock. A section on special needs population, including the elderly, disabled, homeless, large families, and female headed households must be provided. The Element must provide policies and programs that address identified housing needs.

Housing element law requires all local governments to plan to meet their existing and projected housing needs including their share of the regional housing need. In the Bay Area, the regional housing need is determined by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) through the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) process. The RHNA projection period for this element is 2014-2022. The RHNA process specifies the number of housing units that must be accommodated in four income categories: very low, low, moderate and above moderate.

It should be noted that the units assigned to Alameda County through the RHNA process do not represent a production quota. Instead, the County is required to demonstrate that there is an adequate capacity for new dwelling units on vacant or underutilized sites.

Table i-1 lists the County’s RHNA allocation for the 2015-2023 implementation period.

Table i-1: Regional Housing Need Allocation (January 1, 2015 – October 31, 2023)

<i>Income Category</i>	<i>Extremely Low/ Very Low < 50% AMI</i>	<i>Low < 80% AMI</i>	<i>Moderate <120% AMI</i>	<i>Above Moderate >120% AMI</i>	<i>Total</i>
Unit Count	430	227	295	817	1,769
Percentage	24.3	12.8	16.7	46.2	100.0%

Source: Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) 2013

The County has an RHNA allocation of 430 very low-income units. Pursuant to State law (AB 2634, Lieber), the County must project the housing needs of extremely low-income households based on Census income distribution, or assume 50% of the very low-income units as extremely low-income units. In the absence of income data for the extremely low-income households, 50% of the very low-income units are assumed to be extremely low-income. Therefore, the County’s RHNA of 430 very low-income units may be divided into 215 extremely low-income units and 215 very low-income units.

Analysis of Constraints on Housing

The element must address any governmental or non-governmental constraints on housing production, and where legally permissible provide the steps needed to remove governmental constraints to the development of housing.

Sites Inventory and Capacity Analysis

The element must include a detailed land inventory and analysis including a specific list of properties that provides information on zoning and General Plan designation, size of the site, existing uses, general analysis of environmental constraints, the availability of infrastructure, and a realistic assessment of development capacity.

Other Requirements

The Housing Element must also address the following items: consistency with other General Plan Elements; the notification of water and sewer providers; and the review of Conservation and Safety Elements.

Review of the Previous Housing Element

The County must review the actual results of the goals, objectives, policies, and programs adopted in the previous housing element, and analyze the differences between what was planned and what was achieved.

CHANGES IN HOUSING ELEMENT LAW

The Housing Element must also address compliance with recent changes to Housing Element Law which include the following requirements:

- AB 720 (Caballero, 2009) Expands the period during which a local government committing assistance to affordable housing may subtract the assisted units from its very low or low income RHNA up to 25% of the total.
- AB 1867 (Harkey, 2010) Allows jurisdictions to count units converted to affordable units with committed assistance in multi-family rental or ownership complexes of three or more units towards up to 25% of the lower income RHNA. Prior law only allowed counting units in developed rental projects with four or more units.
- SB 812 (Ashburn, 2010) Amended State housing element law to require the analysis of the disabled to include an evaluation of the special housing needs of persons with developmental disabilities.
- AB 1103 (Huffman, 2011) Allows, under specific circumstances, counting foreclosed units converted to affordable housing through acquisition or purchase of affordability covenants.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The inclusion of community stakeholders in the Housing Element public participation process helps to ensure that appropriate housing strategies are efficiently and effectively evaluated, developed, and implemented. The public outreach process consisted of the following strategies:

- Public Hearings - The Planning Commission held public hearings on February 5, 2014 to initiate the preparation of the Housing Element. Meetings on draft chapters were held on March 17th, May 5th, June 2nd, July 21st, and October 6, 2014. On November 17, 2014 the draft Housing Element was discussed in its entirety. Public input was permitted at all of these meetings. At least four additional public meetings are planned following the revision of the Housing Element as recommended by State HCD. Public meetings are planned with the Alameda County Planning Commission, Board of Supervisor's (BOS) – Transportation and Planning and Unincorporated Services Committees, and the full BOS.
- World Wide Web - Alameda County created a web page to keep the community informed about the preparation of the Housing Element. This web page provided links to the previous element, as well as documents from each of the meetings held by the Planning Commission Subcommittee.
- Outreach - Alameda County staff contacted over 200 groups and individuals via mail and

e-mail to invite them to each of the public meetings/hearings, provide staff contact information, and to direct them to the Housing Element Update webpage. Examples of the individuals and organizations contacted include housing developers, homeowner's associations, and industry advocacy groups.

Comments received from the public participation process are summarized in Appendix H.

PREVIOUS PLANNING EFFORTS

This is the eighth Alameda County Housing Element. The current Housing Element was adopted by the Board of Supervisors April 12, 2011.

CHAPTER I- HOUSING PLAN

INTRODUCTION

The focus of the Alameda County Housing Element is the provision of safe, decent and affordable housing for all residents of the unincorporated areas. The goals, principles and policies set forth in the following section provide the foundation for Alameda County's housing strategy and guide its housing programs. The goals represent the community's desired outcomes, while the principles describe the underlying beliefs that support the goals, and the policies guide the County's decision making. Finally, housing programs are presented in a subsequent subsection. These programs represent the actions that the County intends to take in order to meet the policy objectives stated in the Housing Element over an eight year period (2015-2023). Many of these programs are ongoing programs and are subject to regulatory constraints and funding availability. There are some programs listed in this document that may require further study and public review before they become formalized. Changes to the County Ordinance or amendments to the General Plan require hearings before both the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors prior to their adoption.

In accordance with State law, Alameda County has established the following outcomes for its housing plan:

- Provide adequate sites, with appropriate zoning and development standards and services to accommodate the locality's share of the regional housing needs for each income level; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(1))
- Assist in the development of adequate and affordable housing to meet the needs of extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(2))
- Address, and where possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement and development of housing, including housing for all income levels and housing for persons with disabilities; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(3))
- Conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(4))
- Preserve assisted housing developments at-risk of conversion to market-rate; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(6)(d))
- Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status or disability; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(5))
- Encourage building development that incorporates sustainable and energy efficient features (Government Code Section 65583(a)(7))

In order to promote housing for all economic levels and household types, the County uses a variety of planning and regulatory tools. While some of these tools are designed specifically to encourage affordable housing, others are intended to promote the development of housing for moderate and above-moderate income households. The County's zoning update process is

intended to craft regulations which encourage the construction of new housing near transit and along the major commercial corridors. The policies and programs outlined below contain a mix of financial and regulatory tools.

Provide Adequate Sites

In order to facilitate the development of housing affordable to persons at various income levels, the County must first identify land that is suitable for housing development. Specifically, the County must identify sites that are appropriately zoned that can be developed to accommodate its regional housing share as defined by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The County must also take the steps necessary to keep this information current and to ensure that this information is accessible and usable by the development community. Housing development must be monitored to ensure that the County's efforts are achieving measurable results towards its goals of housing access and affordability.

Goal 1: Zone sites suitable for housing development that can accommodate a range of housing by type, size, location and tenure and income levels in accordance with the County's RHNA.

Policy 1.1: Assist housing developers in identifying and consolidating suitable sites for the development of housing affordable to a wide range of households.

Policy 1.2: Consider all County-owned and other public lands for their suitability as housing sites and adopt and support land use plans, disposition agreements and development programs to provide a range of housing on appropriate sites.

Policy 1.3: Maintain an inventory of land that is appropriately zoned for a mix of housing types, including multi-family and single family, rental and sale housing which is consistent with the demand for these types of units and the County's RHNA.

Policy 1.4: Provide timely reports on the status of housing development in the Unincorporated County to the Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors and State HCD.

Policy 1.5 Review underutilized potential residential development sites and revise zoning, as appropriate, to increase densities while ensuring compatibility with surrounding uses.

Policy 1.6 Continue to allow emergency shelters without a conditional use permit or other discretionary permit in the R-4 Zone subject to appropriate development standards pursuant to Government Code Sec. 65583.a.4.

Policy 1.7 Work with cities and LAFCO to ensure that new planned residential communities in cities' spheres of influence provide adequate allocations of affordable housing.

Policy 1.8 Work with cities and developers to research incentives for sharing Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) credits for units

constructed within city boundaries through a multi-jurisdictional agreement.

Policy 1.9 Work with cities, community organizations and neighborhood groups to facilitate infill housing development in conjunction with neighborhood revitalization.

Programs

Residential Sites Inventory

The County shall maintain an inventory of land with zoning and adequate infrastructure and services to meet the County's Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Allocation of 1,769 units.

Objectives:

- Continue to provide adequate sites to accommodate the County's RHNA of 1,769 units.
- Maintain an up-to-date inventory of vacant/underutilized residential sites as funding permits and make the inventory readily available to potential developers
- Highlight small sites that may be consolidated to accommodate additional housing units and maximize their development potential
- Monitor the redevelopment of mixed use sites to ensure that the County complies with Government Code Section 65863. Specifically, the County will compare the number of dwelling units constructed to the realistic development capacity provided in the Sites Inventory (Appendix A). If fewer units were constructed than projected, the County shall determine if the remaining parcels on the County's Sites Inventory are sufficient to meet the County's RHNA, and if not it shall identify additional sites or rezone parcels as need to make up the deficiency.
- After the Housing Element has been adopted, post sites inventory on the County's website

Timeframe: 2015-23
Responsible Agency: Community Development Agency (CDA)-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

Web Based Zoning and Planning Information

Information is essential for effective land use planning, and the County will make data available to support residential and commercial development in the unincorporated areas.

Objective:

- Provide a centralized, accessible, web based information service for each parcel in Unincorporated Alameda County.

Timeframe: 2015
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

Annual Progress Report

Per Government Code Section 65400, local governments are required to annually report on the progress of implementation of their general plans. With respect to the housing element portion of the annual report, State law requires, by April 1 of each year, the local planning agency

provide an annual report to the local government's legislative body, to the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) and to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (State HCD). This report should include the following information:

- The "status of the plan and progress in its implementation;"
- The "progress in meeting its share of regional housing needs determined pursuant to Government Code Section 65584;" and
- Local efforts to "remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement and development of housing pursuant to Government Code Section 65583(c)(3)."

Objectives:

- Prepare an annual report for submission to State HCD by April 1st of each year during the planning period;
- Initiate implementation activities as prescribed in the adopted Housing Element, and ensure an effective program of ongoing monitoring to track housing needs and achievements;
- Monitor legislation and issues related to the maintenance and development of housing;
- Report on the development of mixed use sites identified in the Sites Inventory to confirm compliance with Government Code Section 65863; and
- Monitor changing circumstances on a continuous basis and make adjustments to programs as necessary to maximize progress toward established goals and objectives.

Timeframe: 2015-23
Responsible Agency: CDA
Funding Source: General Fund

Assist in the Development of Affordable Housing and Special Needs Housing

The County is committed to supporting the development of housing of varying types, sizes and affordability levels for its current and future residents. Certain populations that have special housing needs and often face limited housing options are targeted populations, including but not limited to; extremely low-income households, seniors, persons requiring emergency or transitional housing, and persons with disabilities. Existing County affordable housing policies include serving extremely low-income, homeless and special needs populations, while also providing mixed-income housing to avoid over concentration and to support inclusion of all segments of the community.

Over 30% of the affordable housing funds administered by the County's Housing and Community Development Department have provided new units targeted to Extremely Low Income (ELI) households. Over the past 15 years, programs administered have produced 320 special needs housing units, including homeless and extremely low income units county-wide. The County will continue to use affordable housing monies to support the development of housing for extremely low-income households. These targets ensure that the County will support the development of affordable housing for all segments of the population and that existing programs are sufficient to meet the Housing Element requirement regarding programs to assist the development of housing to meet the needs of Extremely Low-Income Households.

Goal 2: To ensure that there is a wide range of housing opportunities for current and future residents of the Unincorporated communities.

Principles: Provide a mix of affordable housing consistent with the needs of all income groups. Priority should be given to maintaining and improving the supply of housing available to very-low, low and moderate-income households. Over-concentrations of subsidized housing should be avoided.

The housing supply should include a mix of rental and sale housing units that is consistent with demand for these types of units.

Ensure adequate housing opportunities for population groups or persons with special housing needs. Housing facilities for these groups should, to the extent possible, be integrated into existing residential neighborhoods and housing developments and sited to provide convenient access to public and private services and facilities.

Permit manufactured homes placed on a permanent foundation, subject to applicable building and zoning regulations, on any site that a conventional dwelling is permitted.

Recognize the value of mobile home parks in providing affordable home ownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income households.

Policy 2.1: Coordinate with the private sector in the development of affordable and special needs housing for rental and homeownership. When appropriate, promote such development through incentives.

Policy 2.2: Participate in State and Federal housing programs.

Policy 2.3: Provide information and education on the need for affordable housing as a means of changing ingrained attitudes against the provision of housing for low and moderate-income households.

Policy 2.4: Encourage participation at the neighborhood level towards housing solutions through seminars, community meetings and dialogue with local officials.

Policy 2.5: Use existing and develop new methods of providing economic assistance for provision of affordable housing for persons residing in the County.

Policy 2.6: Encourage federal, State and local legislation and programs to provide housing assistance.

Policy 2.7: Encourage and support research to enable more rapid data collection and analysis in the field of housing.

Policy 2.8: Prevent exclusionary housing actions that put undue pressures on surrounding communities.

- Policy 2.9:** Encourage the use of “accessible design” existing residential units, and ensure that new units comply with accessibility standards subject to applicable ordinances.
- Policy 2.10:** Promote the use of density bonuses and other incentives to facilitate the development of new housing for extremely low-, very low-, and low-income households.
- Policy 2.11:** Sponsor and support legislation to provide and expand funding for affordable housing; including a replacement for tax increment funding (former redevelopment set aside funding), continued support for federal tax incentive programs like Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Mortgage Credit Certificates, and tax-exempt financing, as well as new programs that may be proposed.
- Policy 2.12:** Maintain and update information on area rental housing availability in assessing demand for rentals.
- Policy 2.13:** Enforce provisions of the County Zoning Ordinance and the County Building Code which permit the placement of pre-1976 modular homes and mobile homes on a permanent foundation to be located on any site on which a conventional dwelling unit is permitted.
- Policy 2.14:** Review existing Mobile Home Rent Stabilization Ordinance and amend to include specific provisions regarding allowable reasons for increasing rents over the allowed maximum, increasing the review fee, and providing for sufficient notice for tenants of all proposed rent increases.
- Policy 2.15:** Continue to support the Community Reinvestment Act to encourage financial institutions to provide loans in high-risk areas and for affordable housing developments.
- Policy 2.16:** Develop local funding mechanisms to finance affordable housing development such as boomerang funds.
- Policy 2.17:** Coordinate planning efforts with local water and sewer providers.
- Policy 2.18:** Codify the County’s practice of offering reasonable accommodations in zoning and other requirements for residential developments serving disabled people or households with a disabled member in accordance with State and federal law, into written policies and procedures. Publicize the availability of these policies and procedures.
- Policy 2.19:** Complete an analysis of the potential and actual governmental constraints upon the development, maintenance and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities.
- Policy 2.20:** Develop programs that remove constraints or provide reasonable accommodations for housing designed for persons with disabilities.

- Policy 2.21:** Support and encourage the development of permanent supportive housing including affordable housing opportunities for households with incomes less than 30% of area median income (AMI).
- Policy 2.22:** In accordance with State law, require that supportive housing be treated as a residential use.
- Policy 2.23:** Pursue State funding sources, such as tax-exempt bond and low-income tax credit allocations, to ensure that the County receives its fair share of statewide funding.
- Policy 2.24:** Facilitate housing development for special needs households, including seniors, farmworkers, persons with disabilities and the homeless.
- Policy 2.25** Support the development of secondary units.
- Policy 2.26** Implement the new County-wide Affordable Housing Trust Fund Program (funded from Residual Tax Increment / former Redevelopment Funding “Boomerang”) identifying the best possible projects from all areas of the county including unincorporated county, and tracking benefits to residents.

Programs

Affordable Housing Development

The Housing and Community Development Department (CDA-HCD) and the Economic and Civic Development Department (CDA-ECD) will collaborate on various projects that will increase the County’s supply of affordable housing. CDA-ECD and CDA-HCD will provide both administrative and financial resources to support affordable housing development within the unincorporated areas. In addition to those incentives provided by CDA-ECD and CDA-HCD, CDA-Planning will provide the following in support of affordable housing development in Unincorporated Alameda County:

- Priority to processing subdivision maps that include affordable housing units;
- Waiver of Park Dedication Fees or Dedication requirements;
- Expedited review for the subdivision are consolidation of larger sites into buildable lots where the development application can be found consistent with the General Plan; and
- Modification of development requirements, such as reduced parking standards for seniors, assisted care, and special needs housing on a case by-case basis.

Objectives:

- Develop a housing strategy (2015-17);
- Identify and complete between four to six new affordable housing projects during the planning period (2015-23); and
- Facilitate the development of affordable housing, especially housing that is affordable to extremely low-income households (i.e. households with incomes less than 30% AMI). (Annually)

Time Frame:	2015-23; Annually
Responsible Agency:	CDA-HCD and CDA-ECD
Funding Sources:	HOME, CDBG (Affordable Housing Pool and Rental Rehabilitation

Program), Alameda County Affordable Housing Trust Fund

Density Bonus Program

State law requires cities and counties to approve density bonuses for housing developments that contain specified percentages of units affordable to very low, low, or moderate income households or units restricted to occupancy by seniors. A density bonus may also be granted for the development of child care facilities. Under state law (California Government Code, Section 65915–65918), housing developers may qualify for several types of density bonuses—up to 35 percent—based on the percentage of housing units in a development affordable to very low-income, low-income, moderate-income, or senior households. Furthermore, density bonus units must be restricted to occupancy by seniors or affordable to the targeted income for at least 30 years. In 2012, the County updated its Density Bonus Ordinance to comply with State law. Depending on the percentage of affordable units and the income level(s) to which the units are affordable, jurisdictions must also grant “concessions” (additional incentives) in addition to a density bonus. Under the basic requirements, jurisdictions must provide one concession. If a higher percentage of affordable units is provided (or if deeper affordability is provided), a new development can be provided with two or three concessions.

In addition to an increase in density, the County’s Density Bonus Ordinance provides a variety of incentives. An applicant is eligible for one or more incentives, depending upon the amount of affordable units that are set aside. An incentive may include any of the following:

1. Approval of a mixed-use development if commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses will help to offset the costs of the housing development.
2. Government-assisted financing, including, but not limited to, mortgage revenue bonds issued by the County;
3. A reduction in site development standards
4. Other incentives proposed by the developer or the County which result in identifiable cost reductions, including but not limited to:
 - Waiver or reduction of certain county fees applicable to restricted units in a housing development,
 - Reduction of interior amenities,
 - Priority processing of a housing development which provides restricted units.

Objectives:

- Continue to ensure that the County’s Ordinance reflects State law.
- Create and distribute brochures and other materials necessary to promote the County’s Density Bonus Program to developers.

Timeframe: 2015-2017; Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

Small Lot Consolidation

The County shall assist in land consolidation by providing sites information to interested developers and provide gap financing assistance, as available, to nonprofit housing developers.

Objective:

- Promote lot consolidation to facilitate housing development

Timeframe: Ongoing

Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

Secondary Units

Secondary units serve to augment resources for senior housing, or other low- and moderate-income segments of the population. The County shall support the construction of secondary units and recognize these units as an important source of affordable housing.

Objectives:

- Promote the Secondary Unit Program to increase public awareness
- Review applications for secondary units
- Periodically review the Zoning Ordinance to maintain consistency with State law.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning, Public Works Administration (PWA)-Building Inspections Division (BID)
Funding Source: General Fund, Permit Fees

Park Fee Waiver

Section 12.20 of the Alameda County Ordinance Code addresses Park Dedication Fees. Under sections 12.20.090 C. and 12.20.110 B. affordable housing developments may be exempted from this fee if they conform to the definition of "affordable housing" provided in 12.20.050:

"Affordable housing" means a rental housing unit with rent restricted for fifty-five (55) years to be affordable to households with incomes of no more than sixty (60) percent of area median income, adjusted for household size, or an ownership housing unit with price restricted for forty-five (45) years to be affordable to households with incomes of no more than eighty (80) percent of area median income, adjusted for household size, as defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development or a successor agency designated by the director of community development.

Objectives:

- Promote affordable housing development and ensures financial feasibility

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

HIV/AIDS Housing and Services

Alameda County's HIV/AIDS housing and service system is supported primarily by two federal programs: the Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Ryan White Comprehensive AIDS Resources Emergency (CARE) Act, a program of the Health Resources and Services Administration of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Locally, HOPWA funds are administered by the Housing and Community Development Department of the Alameda County Community Development Agency (CDA-HCD), and Ryan White funds are administered by the Office of AIDS Administration in the Alameda County Public Health Department (PHD-OAA).

Objective:

- Address the housing and needs of low income people with HIV/AIDS and their families.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-HCD and the PHD-OAA
Funding Source: HOPWA, CARE, and McKinney-Vento Funds

First Time Homebuyer Resources

The Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development maintains a website with information pertinent to first-time homebuyers. The site includes links to both state and federal homeownership resources, as well as information on predatory lending and financial literacy.

Objectives:

- Continue to provide resources for first time homebuyers
- Periodically update the website as new information and programs become available

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-HCD
Funding Source: Various

Mortgage Credit Certificate

The Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC), authorized by Congress in the Tax Reform Act of 1984, provides assistance to first-time homebuyers for the purchase of owner-occupied single family homes, duplexes, townhomes, and condominiums.

The program provides the income eligible buyer with an opportunity to reduce the amount of federal income tax otherwise due by an amount equal to 15% of the mortgage interest payments at a dollar for dollar credit. The remaining 85% can be taken as the usual allowable deduction of the itemized return. The result increases the household's overall income and ability to qualify for a mortgage loan.

Objective:

- Assist 5-7 low and moderate income first time homebuyers in the unincorporated areas annually.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-HCD
Funding Source: Mortgage Credit Certificate

Section 8 Housing Programs

The Housing Authority of the County of Alameda (HACA) operates the programs listed below in Unincorporated Alameda County and several cities within the County. The programs are administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). They provide rental housing or rental assistance for low-income families, the elderly, people with disabilities, and others.

The Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP): Over 7,000 families and landlords participate in the HCVP. The HCVP is the federal government's major program for assisting very low-income families, the elderly, and the disabled to afford decent, safe, and sanitary

housing in the private market. Since housing assistance is provided on behalf of the family or individual, participants are able to find their own housing, including single-family homes, townhouses and apartments. The family's portion of the rent ranges from 30 to 40 percent of the total household income. HACA pays the difference directly to the landlord.

The Section 8 Project-Based Voucher Program (PBV): This program subsidizes the rent and utilities of a unit in a subsidized development. HACA provides 18 units of Section 8 Project-Based assistance in Unincorporated Alameda County.

Objective:

- Provide rental assistance to 600 extremely low and very low income households in the unincorporated areas during the planning period.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: HACA
Funding Source: HUD - Section 8

Family Self Sufficiency Program (FSS)

The objective of the FSS program is to reduce or eliminate the dependency of low-income families on welfare assistance and on Section 8, public assistance, or any Federal, State, or local rent or homeownership program. HACA measures the success of its FSS program by the number of FSS families, who have become welfare free, obtained their first job or a higher paying job, obtained a diploma or higher education degree, or similar goals that will assist the family in obtaining economic independence.

Affordable decent, safe, and sanitary housing provides a family a measure of stability. FSS builds on that foundation made possible by the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program (HCVP). FSS participants sign a 5-year Contract of Participation. HACA's FSS Counselors leverage public- and private-sector resources to provide and facilitate the case management, education and job training opportunities that can help families become economically independent. FSS also offers a homebuyers education and financial incentive program to help participants purchase a home of their own upon successful completion of their Contract of Participation or upon achievement of certain interim goals.

HACA's FSS program has successfully graduated over 150 families throughout Alameda County. Over 20 of those families have become homeowners.

Objective:

- Assist 20 Section 8 recipients in the unincorporated areas to achieve self-sufficiency during the planning period.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: HACA
Funding Source: HUD - Section 8, additional public and private funds

Housing Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities

The housing needs of persons with disabilities, including persons with developmental disabilities are typically not addressed by Title 24 Regulations. In addition to housing affordability, persons with disabilities may need to modify an existing unit or require a varying range of supportive housing environments. The County will encourage the development of supportive housing for persons with disabilities, including developmental disabilities, through the following actions:

Affordable housing is particularly sensitive to price considerations, and so the County will evaluate its existing policies to identify and mitigate those requirements, procedures, fees and exactions that may constrain the development and maintenance of affordable housing within the unincorporated areas.

Goal 3: Mitigate governmental constraints or mandates to housing development and affordability.

Principles: Provide a mix of affordable housing consistent with the needs of all income groups. Priority should be given to maintaining and expanding the supply of housing available to extremely-low, very-low, low and moderate-income households. Over concentrations of subsidized housing should be avoided.

Policy 3.1: Maintain a community-based Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, whose purpose would be to assist the County in developing proposed changes to zoning regulations, site review requirements, and similar requirements as noted in the Housing Element implementing actions listed below.

Policy 3.2: Review ordinances and requirements that may unnecessarily increase the cost of housing or impede implementation of the Housing Element.

Policy 3.3: Increase the height limit to a maximum of 40 feet in transit-oriented mixed-use development districts and high-density residential districts to ensure that multi-family housing can be effectively built. Allow exceptions to this maximum through the use of Conditional Use Permits.

Policy 3.4 Promote intergovernmental coordination in review and approval of residential development proposals when more than one governmental agency has jurisdiction.

Policy 3.5: Develop and implement a reasonable accommodations program.

Policy 3.6: Pursue policy changes at the State level to remove barriers to the production of affordable housing.

Policy 3.7: Maintain and administer clear development standards, and approval procedures for residential development.

Policy 3.8: Seek strategies to streamline or expedite the environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Programs

Ordinance Review Committee

The County regulates the type, location, density, and scale of residential development in the unincorporated areas primarily through the Zoning Ordinance. Zoning regulations are designed to protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of residents as well as implement the policies of the County General Plan. The County is engaged in an ongoing process of

reviewing the Zoning Ordinance for consistency with State laws. For this purpose Alameda County has established an Ordinance Review Committee. The goal of this review is to ensure that the County's requirements and standards do not act as a constraint to the development of affordable housing. The County will review the following policies in order to mitigate potential constraints to housing and to ensure consistency with State law:

- Review reasonable accommodation procedures to ensure their compatibility with fair housing laws, State Housing Element law, and the Health and Safety Code (2015-17);
- Evaluate the County's Ordinance with respect to Secondary Units and amend it as necessary for consistency with State law (2015-17);
- Evaluate the Park Dedication fee structure to ensure that it does not pose a constraint to the development of affordable housing (2015-17);
- Analyze the 25-foot height requirement in medium density residential zones and other zones, and consider modifications to these requirements, as appropriate (2015-17);
- Analyze the impact of the County's parking requirements on the development of housing and modify the requirements if needed, especially as they relate to the provision of affordable and senior housing (2015-17);
- Monitor the comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Update to ensure that proposed amendments do not pose an undue constraint on housing development (2015-23); and
- Review requirements for on- and off-site improvements for new developments, define what "excessive" requirements are, identify "excessive" potential requirements, and make every effort to reduce these "excessive" requirements, if any. (Ongoing)

Objectives:

- Periodically review proposed changes to the Alameda County Zoning Ordinance to ensure consistency with the Housing Element law and State and Federal fair housing laws.
- Ensure that County regulations do not unnecessarily constrain housing development
- Coordinate efforts with other County agencies as needed

Timeframe: Annually
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning, ACFD, PWA, and others
Funding Source: General Fund

Environmental Review Streamlining

The County shall implement the provisions of SB 375 streamlining the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process for Transit Priority Projects and projects that conform to the Sustainable Communities Strategy and meet specific criteria set forth in SB 375.

Objective:

- Support the development of housing near transit

Timeframe: Annually
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: General Fund

Intergovernmental Coordination

Housing development often requires the input of more than one governmental body. Lack of coordination can lead to delays in project approvals and added housing costs. During the planning period the County will promote housing development by ensuring the required reviews

areas adjacent to and on the edges of residential areas. Public facilities in and services to residential areas should be adequately maintained and, where necessary, improved.

- Policy 4.1:** Enforce applicable provisions of the housing and building codes.
- Policy 4.2:** Stimulate neighborhood and community improvement by providing financial and technical assistance in the form of low interest loans, technical assistance and code enforcement.
- Policy 4.3:** Sponsor and support legislation that would increase funding available to low and moderate income housing rehabilitation programs.
- Policy 4.4:** Provide adequate funding for maintenance and improvement of public facilities within the Unincorporated areas, such as child care, and services provided to residential areas.
- Policy 4.5:** Enforce the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance. Review and revise, as necessary.
- Policy 4.6:** Enforce applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.
- Policy 4.7:** Continue to provide accessibility improvements under housing rehabilitation programs to increase the ability of physically disabled people to a) obtain and retain appropriate housing, and b) live independently.
- Policy 4.8:** Prepare a study to determine the cost and feasibility of reinstating housing code enforcement by the County Building Inspection Department.
- Policy 4.9:** Continue to support programs designed to rehabilitate deteriorated units and encourage the maintenance and minor repair of structurally sound housing units to prevent their deterioration.
- Policy 4.10:** Continue to support the Community Reinvestment Act to encourage financial institutions to provide loans in high-risk areas and for affordable housing developments.
- Policy 4.11:** Review and, as appropriate, revise or create zoning districts and regulations, and site development and planned development district standards and guidelines to support appropriate mixed-use residential/commercial development.
- Policy 4.12:** The County shall continue to support efforts to alleviate individual and community issues associated with foreclosures to preserve homeownership and promote neighborhood stability.

Policy 4.13: Continue to provide ongoing infrastructure maintenance in existing residential neighborhoods through the capital improvement program (CIP).

Policy 4.14: Continue to participate in the CDBG, HOME and related programs.

Programs

Minor Home Repair

Alameda County provides grants for emergency repairs of plumbing, carpentry, electrical, railings, grab bars, toilets, water heaters, furnaces, doors, locks and more. The applicant must be the owner of record and the combined income of the household must meet program requirements.

Objectives:

- Continue to provide rehabilitation grants to qualified lower income homeowners.
- Assist 150 lower income households over the planning period.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA- Neighborhood Preservation and Sustainability (NPS), CDA-HCD and CDA-ECD
Funding Source: CDBG

Accessibility Grants

Alameda County offers Accessibility grants for seniors or persons with special needs to install ramps, railings, doorways, counter height modifications, etc. Tenants and/or property owners may apply for assistance.

Objectives:

- Continue to provide accessibility grants to qualified persons.
- Assist 20 households over the planning period.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: NPS, CDA-HCD and CDA-ECD
Funding Source: CDBG

Rehabilitation Loans

The Alameda County Rehabilitation Loan Program provides eligible lower income homeowners with below market-rate deferred loans to correct major health and safety deficiencies and make needed accessibility modifications. Loans may be secured for up to \$60,000. Repayment may be deferred until the property is sold refinanced or title transferred.

Objectives:

- Provide loans to qualified lower income homeowners
- Distribute information on the program
- Assist 14 homeowners during the planning period

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA
Funding Source: CDBG

Foreclosure Prevention

Unincorporated Alameda County has a high number of foreclosures, and the County is committed to distributing information to help residents avert foreclosure.

Objectives:

- Provide up to date information about avoiding and dealing with foreclosure.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-HCD
Funding Source: Various

Healthy Homes Program

The Board of Supervisors passed a resolution officially establishing the Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program (ACLPPP) in 1991. The resolution allowed cities in the County to participate in and support the Program by assessing an annual \$10 fee on all residential dwellings constructed before 1978, the first year that the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) banned lead in paint for residential use. The cities of Oakland, Berkeley, and Alameda were the first to participate in the program and the city of Emeryville joined in 1992. The program is governed by the Joint Powers Authority (JPA) which is composed of elected officials from each participating city and a community representative.

From the start, the ACLPPP has demonstrated the importance and effectiveness of addressing housing conditions in order to improve the health of families. It soon became clear that many clients had multiple housing conditions that affected their health; pests, mold, and ventilation issues causing asthma triggers, a lack of fire and carbon monoxide detectors, and safety hazards causing injuries.

The ACLPPP was a step ahead of a national trend to recognize the importance of a multi-faceted approach to making homes healthy places for people to live. The Program began integrating healthy homes messages into its education and outreach, and training public health home visitors, housing program staff and others in the principles of a healthy home.

In 2002 the ACLPPP received a Healthy Homes grant from HUD to conduct education and housing repairs in homes of children with asthma. The Program has continued to integrate healthy housing messages into its services, work with community partners and is now in its third Healthy Homes grant project. As a result, the name was changed from the Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program to the Alameda County Healthy Home Department.

The Alameda County Healthy Homes Department's unique multi-disciplinary approach has received federal and state funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Center for Disease Control (CDC), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of Health Services (DHS).

Objectives:

- Prevent childhood lead poisoning and other health-related environmental problems

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: Healthy Homes Department
Funding Source: HUD, EPA, CDC and DHS

Code Enforcement

The Code Enforcement Division is headed by the Code Enforcement Manager, an Assistant Deputy Director, and is responsible for enforcement of the Zoning Ordinance, the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance, the Abandoned Vehicle Abatement Ordinance, the Building Code, the Housing code, and sections of the Fire Code, as well as land use regulations. Complaints usually derive from an illegal activity on or use of a property, such as operating a business in a residential district or an illegal dwelling unit. Investigations of violations occur on a complaint basis; as current staffing is not adequate to seek out violations.

Objectives:

- Continue to enforce applicable sections of the Alameda County Ordinance and related land use regulations
- Investigate the cost of housing code enforcement
- Seek additional funding opportunities to increase staffing

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning, Code Enforcement Division
Funding Source: General Fund and Planning Fees

Preserve Units at Risk

There is an ever present need for affordable housing, particularly for seniors and low-income households. In order to keep pace with the current and rising demand for affordable housing, the County must not only support programs that encourage the development of new housing units, but it must also preserve existing subsidized affordable housing. During the planning period the County will take steps to prevent the conversion of subsidized affordable housing units to market rate housing.

Goal 5: Seek to preserve units at risk of losing their affordability restrictions.

Principle Provide a mix of affordable housing consistent with the needs of all income groups. Priority should be given to maintaining and improving the supply of housing available to extremely-low, very-low, low and moderate-income households. Over-concentrations of subsidized housing should be avoided.

Policy 5.1: Monitor and encourage Federal and State efforts to ensure retention of existing federally subsidized housing stock.

Policy 5.2: Evaluate the feasibility of allocating local resources to preserve existing affordable housing units and prevent the displacement of low- and moderate- income households.

Policy 5.3: Evaluate potential impacts of public and private projects on the existing housing supply. Restrict development or require that adequate replacement housing be provided when projects will result in substantial losses of low and moderate cost housing units.

Policy 5.4: Continue to maintain a system for keeping track of all subsidized low and moderate-income units.

Programs

Preservation of At Risk Housing

44 units of housing are at risk of conversion to market rate units during the planning period. The County will monitor all units considered at risk of conversion, and to the extent feasible, work to preserve the affordability of these units.

Objectives:

- Maintain a database of subsidized housing units in order to monitor the status of units at risk of conversion
- Pursue funding from private, State and Federal programs to assist in preserving at risk housing
- Provide assistance via the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program to households displaced due to the expiration of affordability restrictions
- Discuss preservation options with at-risk project owners
- Contact nonprofit housing developers to collaborate on projects that preserve units at risk
- Provide financial assistance to nonprofit housing developers to either acquire or rehabilitate units at risk of conversion
- Ensure that property owners comply with State laws requiring them to notify tenants one year in advance of their intent to terminate their subsidy contract or affordability covenants.
- Provide technical assistance to tenants to access other affordable housing resources

Timeframe: 2015-23
Responsible Agency: CDA-HCD and HACA
Funding Source: General Fund, HUD, HOME, and Section 8

Condominium Conversion

The County's apartment housing stock represents an important source of affordable housing to lower and moderate income households. Loss of apartment housing due to conversion to common interest developments (such as condominiums) compromises the County's ability to address rental housing needs. However, condominium may also provide affordable housing opportunities. In response to these concerns, in 1979 the County drafted guidelines to regulate the condominium conversion process. The guidelines list specific performance standards that must be met prior to conversion which include requirements for parking, open space, and energy efficiency. The guidelines also establish provisions for protecting the rights of tenants currently residing in units that are approved for conversion. These provisions include specific purchasing rights for tenants, as well as eviction clauses to which the owners must adhere.

Objectives:

- Continue to enforce the Condominium Conversion Guidelines

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning, PWA-Development Services
Funding Source: Planning and Permit Fees

Promote Equal Housing Opportunities

Access to housing is a matter of great concern to all persons; therefore Alameda County is

committed to efforts to identify and prevent housing discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex, family or marital status, national origin, color, age, physical or mental disability, or sexual orientation.

Goal 6: To ensure equal housing opportunity for all persons without discrimination in accordance with State and Federal laws.

Principle Fair Housing: All persons and organizations which finance, sell, rent or perform property management functions for rental properties should do so in accordance with State and Federal Fair Housing Laws..

Policy 6.1: Codify the County’s practice of offering reasonable accommodations in zoning and other requirements for residential developments serving disabled people or households with a disabled member in accordance with State and federal law, into written policies and procedures. Publicize the availability of these policies and procedures.

Policy 6.2: Continue to develop analysis of impediments to fair housing.

Policy 6.3: Develop programs that remove constraints or provide reasonable accommodations for housing designed for persons with disabilities.

Policy 6.4: Continue to support organizations that are active in fair housing education and counseling and housing discrimination investigation.

Policy 6.5: Facilitate the education of residents about their fair housing rights and of the process to make appropriate referrals for fair housing complaints.

Programs

Fair Housing Services

Alameda County HCD provides fair housing services through its contract with the Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO). Funding for fair housing is through Federal Community Development Block Grants. Fair Housing services are provided in English with translation services available. Services include:

- Dissemination of materials pertaining to tenant rights;
- Investigation of housing discrimination complaints;
- Administration or judicial enforcement efforts related to individual or systemic forms of discrimination, conciliation by the fair housing agencies themselves, and follow-up;
- Public education and targeted outreach;
- Management training on fair housing laws;
- Tester recruitment and training for investigating complaints;
- Studies or audits to uncover patterns of discrimination;
- Counseling likely and actual victims of discrimination, housing providers, homeowners, insurers, lender and other industry representatives; and
- Landlord/tenant referrals.

Administrative remedies for housing discrimination are available through the California State Department of Fair Employment and Housing and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD investigates most discrimination complaints on mortgage lending due to the length of time, nature, and cost of such investigations.

Objectives:

- Reduce housing discrimination through the provision of fair housing and landlord/tenant services
- Pursue and allocate CDBG funds to support fair housing opportunities for all residents

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-HCD
Funding Source: CDBG

Environmental Sustainability

Land use and development have long lasting impacts upon the environment and individual health and well-being. Alameda County believes that thoughtful consideration must be given to how buildings are sited, designed, constructed and maintained if the County and region are to reverse harmful environmental impacts, particularly in the area of climate change. The County is interested in the identification and promotion of sustainable and healthy development practices that will lead to reductions in green house gas emissions and air pollution, promote greater housing choice and shorter commutes, reduce fossil fuel consumption, and provide for walkable communities and safe bicycle routes.

Goal 7: To minimize the adverse environmental impacts of new residential development

Principles: Encourage new residential development to locate on vacant or underutilized sites within the existing urban area, or on land contiguous to existing urban areas and where development would result in more efficient use of existing public services and facilities and improve housing opportunities close to employment centers, shopping areas, preschools and schools, and major transportation facilities.

In terms of site planning and building design, all new residential projects should prevent underutilization of scarce land resources while also being compatible with adjoining residential uses.

Residential projects should utilize a variety of housing types, unit clustering, and special construction techniques, where these will preserve natural topographic, landscape and scenic qualities.

Encourage the utilization of passive and active solar energy collection systems and other energy saving and water conservation measures in residential developments.

All residential projects should be sited, designed and landscaped to: ensure privacy and adequate light, air and ventilation to units and residential open space areas; provide adequate and usable private indoor and outdoor spaces; and ensure adequate visual and acoustical buffering and/or separation between residential units and adjoining non-residential units and major transportation facilities. Wherever possible the principles of the Eden Area Livability Initiative shall be used to guide land use policy and decision making.

- Policy 7.1:** Review and, as appropriate, revise zoning regulations, site development standards, and planned development district standards and guidelines to favor in-fill development.
- Policy 7.2:** Review and, as appropriate, revise service-related development fees and assessments to encourage development in areas where minimal improvements to infrastructure would be required.
- Policy 7.3:** Review utilization of Secondary Unit provisions of Zoning Ordinance. Review standards and revise, as needed to promote utilization while minimizing adverse impacts.
- Policy 7.4:** Develop and consider adoption of revisions to Zoning Ordinance to require minimum densities for new residential developments in all residential zoning categories.
- Policy 7.5:** Identify areas adjacent to or in close proximity to transit and transportation corridors that are appropriate for high-density residential development. Re-zone as appropriate to increase densities.
- Policy 7.6:** Continue specific policies and guidelines for development in areas of significant environmental resources and hazards.
- Policy 7.7:** Enforce requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and "Title 24" of the State Building Code and any other requirements providing for solar access and energy conservation.
- Policy 7.8:** Promote energy efficiency and solar generation through provision of low-interest loans, grants, and technical assistance.
- Policy 7.9:** Evaluate current policies to ensure consistency and compliance with statewide efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.
- Policy 7.10:** Promote land development that is consistent with state efforts to reverse climate change.

Policy 7.11: Participate in county-wide, regional and national efforts that promote sustainable development practices.

Policy 7.12: Support innovative strategies for the adaptive reuse of residential, commercial, and industrial buildings to provide for a variety of housing types and residential uses.

Policy 7.13: Utilize adopted plans, environmental review, site review and planned development provisions.

Programs

Implement the Community Climate Action Plan

The County adopted the Community Climate Action Plan in 2011, and incorporated the document into its General Plan in 2014. Over the next several years, the County will continue to strategize and coordinate efforts to implement the Plan.

Objectives:

- Implement the Community Climate Action Plan

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: CDA-Planning
Funding Source: Various

StopWaste.org

StopWaste.Org is a public agency formed in 1976 by a Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement among the County of Alameda, each of the fourteen cities within the county, and two sanitary districts. The agency serves as the Alameda County Waste Management Authority and the Alameda County Source Reduction and Recycling Board. In this dual role StopWaste.Org is responsible for the preparation and implementation of the County Integrated Waste Management Plan and Hazardous Waste Management Plan as well as the delivery of voter approved programs in the areas of waste reduction, recycled product procurement, market development and grants to non-profit organizations, to help the County achieve its 75% waste diversion goal. In support of this goal StopWaste.org operates several programs which emphasize sustainability and waste reduction these include: the Bay Friendly Gardening Program; Green Building; the Environmental Preferable Purchasing Program; and the irecycle@school Program.

Objectives:

- Provide strategic planning, research, education and technical assistance to the public, businesses and local governments.
- Initiate innovative programs and facilities to maximize waste prevention, recycling and economic development opportunities.
- Serve as a pro-active public policy advocate for long term solutions to our challenges.
- Partner with organizations with compatible goals.

Timeframe: Ongoing
Responsible Agency: StopWaste.org
Funding Source: Facilities Fees and fees paid for waste disposal

Infill, Mixed Use and Transit Oriented Developments

Infill projects are generally defined as projects occurring on parcels where existing infrastructure (streets, sidewalks, sewers, water) is present and there is an active or recently expired use. Mixed use developments generally combine residential uses with one or more uses such as commercial, civic, or recreational. Transit oriented development refers to projects that occur in close proximity to a transit access point (typically bus, train, or ferry). Mixed use and transit oriented developments offer effective solutions to problems that many communities face: the scarcity of affordable housing, the need for economic investment, water and air pollution, the preservation of open space, and public health concerns. These strategies can yield many benefits, these include:

- Efficient use of existing infrastructure and facilities;
- Encouraging investment in existing urban centers;
- Reducing urban sprawl by using infill lots and applying compact development patterns;
- Minimizing traffic congestion by providing housing close to employment centers and child care facilities;
- Creating sufficient density to support adjacent businesses;
- Lowering greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging the use of public transportation; and
- Improving public health by offering safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists

Currently the San Lorenzo Village and the Ashland/Cherryland Business District Specific Plans allow for mixed use developments. The recently revised Castro Valley and Eden Area General Plans include designations that would permit mixed use and transit oriented developments in appropriate locations in these plan areas as well.

Objectives:

- Implement the Eden Area and Castro Valley Area Plans as these plans contain policies to promote and support infill, mixed use and transit oriented developments; (2015-17)
- Investigate and develop programs to promote the redevelopment of infill sites, mixed use and transit oriented developments; these programs may include: annual outreach and marketing to developers; deferring fees for projects that would require lot consolidation; expedited permit processing; targeting specific financial resources; and modifying development standards (Annually);
- Investigate incentives to support infill, mixed use and transit oriented developments(Annually);
- Work with BART and the City of San Leandro to develop a station area plan that would facilitate transit oriented development adjacent to the Bayfair BART Station (2015-17);
- Maintain the Density Variable (DV) zoning designation which provides a density bonus of 75% for existing or consolidated sites that have a minimum of 100 foot median lot width and are at least 20,000 square feet in area (Annually);
- Publicize parcels with the Density Variable (DV) zoning designation to encourage the redevelopment of small infill sites (Annually);
- Complete the update of the Ashland/Cherryland Business District Specific Plan (2015-17); and
- Pursue SB 375 funding opportunities (Annually).

Timeframe:	2015-23
Responsible Agency:	CDA-Planning, CDA-ECD
Funding Source:	General Fund

SUMMARY OF QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES

The table below illustrates the quantified objectives for the unincorporated areas of Alameda County. These figures are an estimate of the number of units likely to be constructed, rehabilitated or conserved/preserved by income level during the planning period.

Table I-1: Quantified Objectives 2015-23

Income Category	New Construction	Rehabilitation	Conservation/ Preservation
Extremely Low/ Very-Low Income	430		22
Low	227	14	22
Moderate	295		
Above Moderate	817		
TOTALS	1,769	14	44

The sources of information for Table IV-1 are as follows:

- The “new construction” objectives are specified by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) during their regional housing needs allocation process. ABAG has designated a total of 1,769 units of housing as the unincorporated areas “fair share” of housing within the 9 county Bay Area region.
- The conservation objectives reflect the 44 units of affordable housing at-risk of conversion to market rate at the Sparkway Commons development.
- The “rehabilitation” objective is based on the projected number of rehabilitation loans to be funded during the planning period.

RESOURCES

The analysis contained in previous Housing Element chapters has shown the extent of unmet housing needs in Unincorporated Alameda County and the gap between the market cost of housing and the ability of low- and moderate-income households to pay for housing. The Housing Element is intended to complement the strategies in the County’s Consolidated Plan, which focuses on the needs of very low- and low-income households and other County planning documents, such as the Eden Area and Castro Valley General Plans.

The County has limited resources with which to address these needs and only a small fraction can be addressed during the time frame of this Housing Element. The amount of assistance required per household is much higher for those with the lowest incomes. This is particularly true for housing programs that produce housing that will remain affordable for many years. The County attempts to maximize the impact of these resources by leveraging other funds wherever possible, particularly from private sources and other public sources. To the extent possible, the County also provides local resources to address housing needs.

The County focuses its limited financial resources on programs that assist households with the greatest needs. In addition, most of the funding sources for the County’s programs restrict eligibility based on income. This means that very low-income and low-income households receive the highest priority for most housing assistance programs. Seniors, homeless persons, persons with disabilities, and large families also have particularly high priority needs for which special programs and funding sources are targeted.

The following sections describe both the administrative and financial resources available to Alameda County in order to pursue its housing goals during the planning period.

Financial Resources

This section identifies federal, state, local, and private financial resources which may be used to meet Alameda County's affordable housing goals. Resources can be sources of funds or technical assistance and can be available to private and non-profit entities as well as to local government agencies. The County actively participates in as many housing programs as possible and aggressively seeks financing and other resources to expand the affordable housing stock countywide. The County continuously submits and supports applications for funding to develop affordable housing. The list includes resources that Alameda County has on-hand or expects to receive, and programs the County may apply for funding. Alameda County closely monitors legislation and State and Federal budget decisions that could impact its community development objectives.

Federal

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds

The Urban County is one of the eight CDBG entitlement jurisdictions in the Alameda County HOME Consortium, which applies annually to HUD for funding from this program. Funding is awarded annually on a formula basis to entitlement jurisdictions. These funds can be used for a variety of housing and community development activities.

Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG)

The ESG program provides homeless persons with basic shelter and essential supportive services. The funds are available for the rehabilitation or remodeling of a building used as a new shelter, operations and maintenance of the facility, essential supportive services, homeless prevention, rapid re-housing activities and grant administration.

Home Investment Partnership Act (HOME)

HOME provides flexible funding to states and local governments for affordable housing programs for low income households. HOME funds can be used to acquire, rehabilitate, finance, and construct affordable rental or ownership housing, as well as to provide tenant-based assistance. In the Home Ownership program, the funds may be used for such items as down payment and closing costs, funding construction costs, or funding permanent loans towards the cost of acquisition.

The County serves as lead agency for the Alameda County HOME Consortium. The Consortium is made up of the Unincorporated County and all of the cities in the County except Berkeley and Oakland. Each year, the Consortium receives HOME funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) through the entitlement process. These funds are then allocated to the participating cities, and the Urban County (a HUD-designated jurisdiction which comprise of the cities of Albany, Dublin, Emeryville, Newark, and Piedmont and the Unincorporated County). As required by HUD, 15% of the total allocation is reserved for use by qualified Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO). The Urban County and CHDO funds, administered by the County, have been used to subsidize the acquisition and rehabilitation, and new construction of a variety of affordable housing projects.

Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)

CDA-HCD administers the HOPWA program for Alameda County, under contract with the City of Oakland. Oakland receives the HOPWA entitlement as the largest city in the Eligible Metropolitan Area. HOPWA funds can be used for a variety of housing and service activities for lower income persons living with HIV and AIDS and are intended to serve all of Alameda County. CDA-HCD is also being funded directly by HUD for Project Independence, a HOPWA Performance Grant, which provides shallow rental assistance and accessibility modifications to people living with HIV/AIDS throughout Alameda County.

Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control

The Community Development Agency's Healthy Homes Department's integrated health, environmental, and housing program is a nationally recognized model. Healthy Homes has successfully completed seven Lead Hazard Control grants from the Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control. These grants have provided funding to reduce lead hazards and provide healthy home interventions in more than 1,300 low income residential units in the County's Lead Abatement Service Area, which includes the cities of Alameda, Berkeley, Emeryville and Oakland. In FY 2014-15, the Healthy Homes Department will be able to utilize a portion of its grant in the Unincorporated County. The Health Homes Department has a projected budget of nearly \$5,000,000 in FY 14/15.

HUD 811 Program Funds

These program funds are awarded to the State of California, which issues a competitive NOFA/RFP for projects State-wide for rental subsidy for up to 5 years at a time.

HUD Section 8 Rental Assistance Program

The Housing Authority of the County of Alameda (HACA) will continue to administer Federal Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers including use of a portion of its vouchers for project-based units.

Low-income Housing Preservation Program (LIHPP)

LIHPP funds are awarded on a competitive basis to preserve federally subsidized affordable rental housing developments.

HEARTH Act Programs

Funding via the HEARTH Act is administered by HUD. In 2009, the HEARTH Act was signed into law and amended and reauthorized the McKinney-Vento Homelessness Assistance Act. The HEARTH Act consolidated the Supportive Housing program, Shelter Plus Care program, and Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) program into the Continuum of Care (CoC) program. Five program components may be funded through the CoC program: permanent housing, transitional housing, supportive services only (SSO), homeless management information system (HMIS) operation and homelessness prevention. The CoC is funded by HUD via a competitive Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process.

A CoC grant may be used to promote the development of supportive housing and supportive services for homeless persons, including innovative approaches to assist homeless persons in the transition from homelessness. The funding can be used for a variety of purposes, including acquisition and rehabilitation, new construction, leasing, operating expenses, and supportive services. Annually, approximately 24 million dollars is allocated by HUD under the CoC program to support efforts to end homelessness in Alameda County.

State

CalHOME

Provides grants to local public agencies and nonprofit developers to assist individual households through deferred-payment loans. It also provides direct, forgivable loans to assist development projects involving multiple ownership units, including single-family subdivisions.

California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA)

CalHFA provides a variety of tax-exempt bond financing for the creation and preservation of affordable housing. CalHFA also provides bond financing for qualified first-time homebuyers.

CalHFA administers the Housing Enabled by Local Partnerships (HELP) program which facilitates affordable housing opportunities through their partnerships with local government entities. In prior years, Alameda County has received funding from HELP. These funds have been used to capitalize a revolving loan fund used for acquisition and construction financing for affordable housing projects located throughout the County.

Low Income Housing Tax Credits (Federal and State)

Tax credits are an important financing resource in Alameda County. Developers can apply to the State for an allocation of tax credits to finance low income rental housing developments. The tax credits are syndicated to corporations in exchange for project equity. The County currently supports and provides local review of applications for Low Income Tax Credits for the California State Tax Credit Allocation Committee.

Mortgage Revenue Bonds

Local jurisdictions can apply to the State for authority to issue tax-exempt mortgage revenue bonds for the purpose of funding affordable housing development and to provide low-interest mortgages to qualified first-time homebuyers. In the past, the County has issued Single-Family Mortgage Revenue Bonds when there has been market demand for this program. The County currently administers a number of Multi-family Mortgage Revenue Bonds for developments within the Unincorporated County and in cities within Alameda County, at the city's request. The County issues Multi-family Mortgage Revenue Bonds when there is market demand for this subsidy source and when the developments meet County standards.

Mortgage Credit Certificates

Alameda County HCD runs the MCC Program and applies to the State for a single family bond allocation to convert to Mortgage Credit Certificates (MCC) annually. The MCC provides a tax credit that subsidize the mortgage interest rate for qualified first-time homebuyers. The County is currently administering a Mortgage Credit Certificate program that supports approximately 60 first-time homebuyers annually countywide. CDA-HCD submits a county-wide application every year for its maximum allocation of MCC's.

Multi-family Housing Program

Local jurisdictions and non-profit housing developers can competitively apply to the State for the purpose of funding affordable multi-family housing developments.

Opportunity Zone Inter-Regional Partnership

The County has two inter-regional partnership-designated jobs/housing balance opportunity zones: one is a project involving Dublin BART station and one for a project at San Lorenzo Village. The County will apply for and support applications for any funds that these projects are eligible for that will assist in implementation.

“Cap and Trade”

Cap-and-Trade” is a new funding source and part of how California is implementing AB32, the 2006 Global Warming Solutions Act, which requires California to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Funds come from the state-held quarterly auction where carbon emission allowance credits are sold to certain high-volume polluters. The State receives revenues from these auctions, and has allocated \$130 of this money in 2014-2015 and 20% yearly thereafter to Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities.

Local

Alameda County Affordable Housing Trust Fund Program (“Boomerang”)

Funded by the Residual Tax Increment funding returned to the County after the dissolution of Redevelopment, the Alameda County Board of Supervisors allocated the First General Funds to Affordable Housing. The Board approved the transfer of these general funds to the Affordable Housing Trust fund to be used County-wide, distributing the funds in accordance with RHNA numbers. The first deposit included all of the “Swept” Housing Funds from the former Redevelopment Agencies \$9.8 Million in FY 14/15. Additional funds will be deposited starting in FY 16/17. These funds are administered by the Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department. They are allocated through a competitive Request for Proposals process, and are administered in accordance with the Affordable Housing Development Program Policies and Procedures.

Planning and Development Impact Fees

Alameda County uses both planning and development impact fees to fund activities related to the development of housing and public infrastructure. Examples include Park Dedication Fees that are used to develop and enhance parks and recreation facilities and Traffic Mitigation Fees that are use for the maintenance of local roads.

One Bay Area Grant

The regional Plan Bay Area program to support and promote Bay Area regional housing growth near jobs and transit is comprised of three parts: land use, housing and transportation. Six investment strategies support these three areas. The investment strategy to “support focused growth” involves the distribution of One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) funds to counties based on population, past housing production of affordable housing, future housing commitments and efforts to produce low-income housing. The current expenditure plan goes through 2016, and primarily directs funds to Oakland, San Francisco and San Jose. The majority of the funds in this funding cycle is intended to be spent primarily in Priority Development Areas (PDA’s). The Unincorporated Alameda County has 4 designated PDA’s. In addition, the County is working with the City of San Leandro on a specific plan for the Bay Fair BART PDA. After 2016, it is unclear where the funds will be directed, but Staff will advocate for resources to the Unincorporated County.

Private

Community Reinvestment Act (CRA)

The Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department encourages local lenders to provide favorable lending terms for projects which involve the provision and/or rehabilitation of affordable rental and ownership housing.

Federal Home Loan Bank Board Affordable Housing Program

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board administers the Affordable Housing Program (AHP) in accordance with the Federal Regulations governing the program. The AHP provides gap subsidy to projects that provide affordable housing for a minimum of 15 years. In Alameda County, these funds have been used in conjunction with County-provided funding to close gaps and deepen affordability on projects located throughout the County.

Other

Local foundations, faith communities, service organizations and private individuals contribute their support for a variety of affordable housing, homeless assistance and prevention programs, which serve the unincorporated areas.

Administrative Resources

The following organizations are primarily responsible for the provision of affordable housing within Unincorporated Alameda County. Over the planning period these groups will work on tasks relating to the construction, acquisition, rehabilitation and conservation of affordable housing stock.

Alameda County Community Development Agency

The mission of the Community Development Agency (CDA) is to enhance the quality-of-life of County residents and plan for the future well-being of the County's diverse communities; to balance the physical, economic, and social needs of County residents through land use planning, environmental management, neighborhood improvement, and community development; and to promote and protect agriculture, the environment, economic vitality and human health. The CDA represents the consolidation of the three key functions: land use planning; community and economic development; and the dispensation of County assets. The following paragraphs describe the functions of the five departments that will be tasked with the implementation of much of the goals, policies and programs of the Housing Element.

Planning Department

The Planning Department plans and oversees new development and redevelopment plans; creates policy for land use; and regulates, monitors and enforces County Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision, Surface Mining, Neighborhood Preservation, and other ordinances. The Planning Department performs municipal-type land use regulation functions for unincorporated areas of the County, ensuring compatible land use for the nearly 136,000 citizens within its jurisdiction. The Planning Department also maintains and updates the County's General Plan and prepares the General Plan Annual Report.

Economic and Civic Development Department (ECD)

On January 10, 2012, the Alameda County Board of Supervisors adopted a Resolution to authorize the County of Alameda, through the Community Development Agency, to serve as both the Successor Agency and Successor Housing Agency to the former Redevelopment Agency of the County of Alameda. The CDA-ECD is currently supporting the development of two affordable housing projects in Unincorporated Alameda County: Ashland Family Housing, and Mercy Senior Housing (San Lorenzo).

Housing and Community Development

The Housing and Community Development Department (CDA-HCD) plays a lead role in the development of housing and programs to serve the county's low and moderate income households, homeless, and disabled populations. CDA-HCD maintains and expands housing opportunities for low--and moderate--income persons and families in the county by:

- Preserving the county’s housing stock through rehabilitation and repair assistance programs.
- Expanding the supply of affordable housing for lower income renters and owners, including first-time homebuyers.
- Serving the needs of the homeless community as the lead agency in the countywide homeless collaborative and partnering with homeless service providers.
- Revitalizing low-income neighborhoods by installing sidewalks and public accessibility improvements, and by constructing neighborhood-serving facilities.

Healthy Homes Department

Established in 1991, the Alameda County Healthy Homes Department has become a national leader in childhood lead poisoning programs, combining health, environmental and residential hazard reduction services under one umbrella. The Alameda County Healthy Homes Department’s unique multidisciplinary approach is serving the community to eliminate environmental lead contamination and prevent childhood lead poisoning.

Alameda County Public Works Agency, Development Services Department

The Development Services Department assists in the planning of new subdivisions, commercial developments, and infrastructure by reviewing development plans, issuing permits, and inspecting building construction and infrastructure to support land development. The Department is composed of the Building Inspection Division, Land Development Division, Grading Permits, and Clean Water Program.

Housing Authority of the County of Alameda

The Housing Authority of the County of Alameda (HACA) operates a number of programs administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development that provide rental housing or rental assistance for low-income families, the elderly, people with disabilities, and others, in much of Alameda County.

Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services

Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services (BHCS), Housing Services Office utilizes Mental Health Services Act funding to develop policies and programs that support homeless individuals and households throughout the unincorporated areas. BHCS supports agencies that provide emergency, transitional and supportive housing services to persons who are currently or at risk of becoming homeless. The programs sponsored by BHCS are designed to assist individuals in their transition to a stable living environment and greater economic self-sufficiency. BHCS also collaborates with the County’s HCD to plan and implement the EveryOne Home program that seeks to prevent and eliminate homelessness throughout Alameda County.

Non Profit Housing Developers

The County’s HCD works with a large number of affordable housing developers and managers. These partnerships allow the County to expand affordable housing opportunities by managing the construction, acquisition, and rehabilitation of housing. These developers include, but are not limited to:

- Eden Housing
- Mercy Housing
- BRIDGE Housing
- Allied Housing

- Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency (BOSS)
- East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation
- Affordable Housing Associates
- Resources for Community Development

CHAPTER II- HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Introduction

State Housing Element Law requires that local jurisdictions outline the housing needs in their community at all income levels and for special needs populations. In order to best address a community's needs, an assessment of its existing housing stock, current populations demographics, and the potential future needs of the community must be reviewed.

The Housing Needs Assessment chapter includes:

- An analysis of population and employment trends and existing and projected housing needs for all income levels;
- An analysis of household characteristics, such as level of payment compared to ability to pay, overcrowding, and housing stock condition;
- An analysis of any special housing needs, such as those of the handicapped, elderly, large families, farm workers, families with female heads of households, and families and persons in need of emergency shelter;
- An analysis of opportunities for energy conservation with respect to residential development; and
- An analysis of existing assisted housing developments that are eligible to change from low-income housing uses during the next 10 years due to termination of subsidy contracts, mortgage prepayment, or expiration of restrictions on use.

This chapter examines current and projected population figures, income levels, ethnic composition, and age composition to obtain a profile of the residents who make up the County's housing market. It also describes characteristics of the housing stock, including general supply and condition. Countywide statistics are occasionally provided to allow the reader a broader understanding of the conditions facing our communities.

Sources of Information

The primary source of demographic, housing, and socioeconomic information used to support the technical analysis in the Housing Element includes data collected by the U.S. Census Bureau. This baseline population, housing, and socioeconomic data for cities and counties is collected every 10 years as part of the national Census. The most recent Census was collected in 2010. The Census Bureau compiles interim data between censuses in the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS, however, represents averaged data over one, three, and five years and is collected from a sample. Averaged data does not offer as complete a snapshot of the community or recognize the changes in that community over time.

Furthermore, a small sample size may result in larger margins of errors. As a result, data taken from the ACS may not accurately reflect community characteristics; however, some data is only available as part of the ACS. Using information obtained from the ACS, HUD creates a special Census tabulation for use in Consolidated Plans. The most recent HUD Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data available was tabulated using the 2006-2010 ACS.

Providing information on Unincorporated Alameda County is not straight-forward because most data sources do not provide aggregate information covering the entire area. The Census

Bureau defines Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo and Sunol as Census Designated Places (CDP's) and provides information on each place. However, there are additional parts of the Unincorporated County that are located outside of the CDP's. It is not always possible to come up with data covering these other areas.

When appropriate, 2010 Census data are augmented with information from the California Department of Finance and State Employment Development Department (EDD). However, the California Department of Finance data does not provide information on the Unincorporated County specifically; rather it provides information on the County and each of the cities. When possible, information on all the cities in Alameda County is summed up and then subtracted from the County-wide total, leaving a remainder, which represents the entire Unincorporated County. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) generates population projections, and provides data on the unincorporated areas of the County. For those situations in which data for the unincorporated areas is not available, County-wide statistics are used to present an overall understanding of the community. Housing market data is obtained from other sources such as DataQuick.

The compilation of information from these sources makes it possible to develop plans and programs to address the needs of our community.

DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE GENERAL POPULATION

Current and Forecasted Population

Unincorporated Alameda County comprises six Census Designated Places (CDPs): Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo and Sunol. A small portion of Alameda County's population is not within a discrete CDP. This is referred to a "remainder". When possible staff will calculate data for the remainder; however, it is not always possible.

The population of Unincorporated Alameda County in 2010, according to ABAG, was 141,266 persons. The Unincorporated County represents approximately nine percent of the County's total population of 1,510,271. Table II-1 shows the projected populations of each jurisdiction within Alameda County in 2020, 2030, and 2040. The cities of Dublin and Emeryville are projected to have the largest percentage increases over that period. In Unincorporated Alameda County, the population is expected to increase from 141,266 persons in 2010 to 165,300 persons in 2040.

The population of Unincorporated Alameda County has been steadily growing for the past 20 years. That growth is expected to continue through 2040. As shown in Table II-2, between 1990 and 2010 the cities' population increased nearly 18 percent, similar to the level of growth experienced by Alameda County during the decade. If Unincorporated Alameda County was to incorporate, it would be the fourth largest city in the County.

Table II-1: Population – Current and Forecasted, Alameda County (2010-2040)

Jurisdiction	Population				Percent Change		
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2010-20	2020-30	2030-40
Alameda County	1,510,271	1,654,200	1,810,300	1,987,900	9.5%	9.4%	9.8%
Alameda	73,812	80,300	87,500	95,500	8.8%	9.0%	9.1%
Albany	18,539	19,700	21,000	22,500	6.3%	6.6%	7.1%
Berkeley	112,580	120,700	129,200	140,100	7.2%	7.0%	8.4%
Dublin	46,036	54,200	63,500	73,800	17.7%	17.2%	16.2%
Emeryville	10,080	13,500	17,100	21,000	33.9%	26.7%	22.8%
Fremont	214,089	232,700	252,800	275,500	8.7%	8.6%	9.0%
Hayward	144,186	157,500	171,800	188,000	9.2%	9.1%	9.4%
Livermore	80,968	88,000	95,600	104,300	8.7%	8.6%	9.1%
Newark	42,573	47,200	52,100	57,600	10.9%	10.4%	10.6%
Oakland	390,724	439,600	492,100	551,100	12.5%	11.9%	12.0%
Piedmont	10,667	10,800	11,000	11,300	1.2%	1.9%	2.7%
Pleasanton	70,285	76,800	83,900	91,800	9.3%	9.2%	9.4%
San Leandro	84,950	91,700	99,200	107,600	7.9%	8.2%	8.5%
Union City	69,516	73,400	77,600	82,500	5.6%	5.7%	6.3%
Unincorporated	141,266	148,100	155,900	165,300	4.8%	5.3%	6.0%

Source: ABAG Projections 2013

Table II-2 shows the population changes in each unincorporated CDP from 1990 to 2010. Castro Valley experienced the largest increase in population; however, Ashland and Cherryland had the greatest percentage increase over that time period.

Table II-2: Population Growth in Unincorporated Alameda County by CDP, 1990-2010

CDP	1990	2000	2010	2000-2010		1990-2010	
				Absolute Change	Percent Change	Absolute Change	Percent Change
Ashland CDP	16,590	20,793	21,925	1,132	5%	5,335	32%
Castro Valley CDP	48,663	57,292	61,388	4,096	7%	12,725	26%
Cherryland CDP	11,088	13,837	14,728	891	6%	3,640	33%
Fairview CDP	9,045	9,470	10,003	533	6%	958	11%
San Lorenzo CDP	19,987	21,898	23,452	1,554	7%	3,465	17%
Sunol CDP ¹	----	1,332	913	-419	-31%	----	----
Remainder ²	----	11,148	8,857	-2,291	-21%	----	----
TOTAL	120,020	135,770	141,266	5,496	4%	21,246	18%

Source: Planning Department, U.S. Census Bureau, 1990, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts, Table DP-1

Data regarding population density, or persons per square mile, changed from 2000 to 2010.

¹ Sunol was not a Census Defined Place (CDP) in 1990, therefore no data exists.

² Due to the lack of information regarding Sunol, a remainder cannot be accurately determined.

Table II-3 shows that San Lorenzo experienced the largest increase in density (8%), while Castro Valley experienced a decline (-7%) over the same period. The change in population density in Sunol is likely attributable to a change in the boundaries of the CDP.

Table II-3: Population Density (Persons per Square Mile), Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000-2010

Place	2000	2010	2000-2010	
			Absolute Change	Percent Change
Ashland CDP	11,284.9	11,926.7	641.8	6%
Castro Valley CDP	3,971.6	3,690.3	-281.3	-7%
Cherryland CDP	11,859.2	12,301.9	442.7	4%
Fairview CDP	3,421.2	3,617.7	196.5	6%
San Lorenzo CDP	7,893.4	8,487.9	594.5	8%
Sunol CDP	40.6	32.9	-7.7	-19%

Source: Planning Department, U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts with TIGER data

Age Distribution

Strikingly, at 12,000 persons per square mile, Ashland and Cherryland have consistently had densities considerably higher than the other unincorporated communities, and is also significantly higher than Alameda County as a whole, which is 2,043 per square mile.

Age is an important demographic factor for analyzing future housing needs and preferences of different age groups. Traditional assumptions are that the younger adult population (ages 20 to 34 years old) and the elderly population (aged 65 and over) tend to favor lower to moderate cost housing options such as smaller apartments, condominiums, and single-family homes due to lower household incomes and smaller household size. The middle age adult population (35 to 64 years old) represents the major market for higher cost condominiums and single-family homes because they have higher household incomes and larger household size. In order to create an economically balanced community, it is important to provide housing options that suit the needs of various age groups, income levels, and household sizes.

The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has compiled data on age distribution in Unincorporated Alameda County. Table II-4 summarizes this data. The number of persons aged 45 to 64 has experienced the largest increase, while the number of children aged 0 to 14 years has declined slightly. These trends are generally consistent with those in Alameda County as a whole and the greater San Francisco Bay Area, where the percentage of middle aged persons and seniors is increasing as a result of an aging baby boomer generation. Persons aged 25 to 54 represent the greatest percentage of the population of Unincorporated Alameda County. In 2000, this group comprised approximately 46 percent of the total population, and in 2010 they accounted for 42 percent of the total population.

Table II-5 compiles age data by place or CDP. Ashland has a median age of 31.4 years, the lowest median age of any CDP. Sunol has a median age of 49.3 years, the highest of any CDP. All CDPs, and the County as a whole, have experienced an increase in median age.

Table II-4: Age Distribution, Unincorporated Alameda County 2000-2010

Age	2000		2010		Percent Change
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Under 5	9,214	6.8%	9,021	6.4%	-0.4%
5 to 9	9,932	7.3%	9,347	6.6%	-0.7%
10 to 14	9,549	7.0%	9,740	6.9%	-0.1%
15 to 19	8,767	6.5%	9,987	7.1%	0.6%
20 to 24	7,481	5.5%	8,640	6.1%	0.6%
25 to 34	19,357	14.3%	18,312	13.0%	-1.3%
35 to 44	23,548	17.3%	19,697	13.9%	-3.4%
45 to 54	19,632	14.5%	22,467	15.9%	1.4%
55 to 59	6,189	4.6%	9,667	6.8%	2.3%
60 to 64	4,735	3.5%	7,574	5.4%	1.9%
65 to 74	8,259	6.1%	8,417	6.0%	-0.1%
75 to 84	6,816	5.0%	5,488	3.9%	-1.1%
85 and over	2,291	1.7%	2,909	2.1%	0.4%
TOTAL	135,770	100.0%	141,266	100.0%	----

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Table II-5: Age Distribution by Place, 2010

Place	Age Distribution						Median Age 2010	Median Age 2000
	0-19	20-34	35-54	55-64	65-74	75+		
Ashland CDP	30.6%	25.2%	27.6%	8.9%	4.2%	3.5%	31.4	30.9
Castro Valley CDP	25.8%	15.9%	31.3%	13.6%	6.6%	6.9%	41.2	39.4
Cherryland CDP	29.3%	25.1%	27.8%	9.3%	4.5%	4.0%	32.3	31.6
Fairview CDP	22.9%	19.0%	30.3%	14.9%	7.0%	5.8%	41.1	39.0
San Lorenzo CDP	27.4%	18.9%	29.5%	11.6%	5.7%	6.9%	37.9	37.7
Sunol CDP	18.8%	13.3%	30.4%	21.1%	11.4%	5.0%	49.3	41.3
Remainder	26.6%	16.9%	29.3%	12.8%	7.6%	6.7%	----	----
Unincorporated	27.0%	19.1%	29.8%	12.2%	6.0%	5.9%	----	----
Alameda County	27.2%	23.7%	17.2%	18.4%	8.5%	5.0%	36.6	34.5

Source: Planning Department, U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts (Table DP-1) and ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Race and Ethnicity

Changes in the racial/ethnic composition of a population may have implications on housing needs. Some groups, whether for cultural or economic reasons, are likely to live with extended family members³. These households, therefore, tend to be larger and require large homes to accommodate their needs.

3 State Department of Housing and Community Development, The State of Housing in California: 2012 Update, August 2012. http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hcd_state_of_housing_ca2012update0812.pdf

Table II-6 shows some significant changes in the racial composition of residents in Unincorporated Alameda County in 2000 and 2010. The number of Asian persons grew by 4.9 percent and those who identified themselves as either Hispanic or Latino increased 8.6 percent between 2000 and 2010. These numerical increases were accompanied by a decrease among non-Hispanic White residents (-14.5%). Non-Hispanic Whites are the largest population group in the County at 37.7 percent, followed by Hispanics and Latinos at 29.6 percent. Whites were in the majority in 2000 at 52.2 percent; however, as of 2010, no single race or ethnic group comprised the majority of residents in Unincorporated Alameda County.

Table II-6: Population by Race and Hispanic Origin, Unincorporated Alameda County 2000-2010

Race/Ethnicity	2000		2010		Percent Change
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
White	70,887	52.2%	53,219	37.7%	-14.5%
Black	11,400	8.4%	13,501	9.6%	1.2%
American Indian	609	0.5%	468	0.3%	-0.1%
Asian	17,847	13.2%	25,471	18.0%	4.9%
Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	846	0.6%	1,256	0.9%	0.3%
Other Race	334	0.3%	320	0.2%	0.0%
Two or More Races	5,357	4.0%	5,151	3.6%	-0.4%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	28,490	21.0%	41,880	29.6%	8.6%
TOTAL	135,770	100.0%	141,266	100.0%	----

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Table II-7 shows the racial and ethnic composition of each unincorporated CDP. Hispanics and Latinos have the largest populations in Ashland and Cherryland. The areas with the highest proportion of whites are Castro Valley, Sunol and the unincorporated remainder. Ashland and Fairview have the highest population proportion that is black. Finally, every area of the County has an Asian population, but the highest proportion resides in San Lorenzo and Castro Valley.

Table II-7: Population by Race and Hispanic Origin by Place, 2010

Place	Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	Non-Hispanic						
		White	Black	American Indian	Asian	Hawaiian / Pacific Islander	Other Race	Two or More Races
Ashland CDP	42.8%	15.6%	18.6%	0.4%	18.1%	1.1%	0.3%	3.1%
Castro Valley CDP	17.4%	49.5%	6.6%	0.3%	21.1%	0.6%	0.2%	4.2%
Cherryland CDP	54.0%	20.9%	10.8%	0.4%	9.2%	1.9%	0.2%	2.7%
Fairview CDP	21.7%	36.2%	20.5%	0.4%	14.8%	1.1%	0.2%	5.0%
San Lorenzo CDP	37.7%	32.4%	4.5%	0.3%	21.1%	0.7%	0.2%	3.0%
Sunol CDP	10.0%	78.8%	0.1%	0.3%	5.3%	0.5%	0.1%	4.9%
Remainder	30.6%	50.4%	8.3%	0.1%	7.7%	1.1%	0.1%	2.1%
Unincorporated	29.6%	37.7%	9.6%	0.3%	18.0%	0.9%	0.2%	3.6%
Alameda County	22.5%	34.1%	12.2%	0.3%	25.9%	0.8%	0.3%	4.0%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013, US Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table DP-1

The 2010 Decennial Census collected data on housing tenure by race. In Unincorporated Alameda County, Asian households are more likely to own their homes than any other group and conversely Black households are the least likely. Of the unincorporated areas, Fairview has the largest percentage of home owners. Fairview also has the highest percentage of home owners for nearly all racial and ethnic groups. When the County as a whole is considered, White households are the most likely to own their homes.

Table II-8: Tenure by Race and Hispanic Origin, Unincorporated Alameda County CDPs, 2010

	Ashland	Castro Valley	Cherryland	Fairview	San Lorenzo	Sunol
<i>Percent Owners</i>						
White	48.5%	73.3%	41.5%	83.4%	81.4%	74.9%
Black	12.6%	36.7%	15.9%	65.9%	37.5%	----
American Indian	33.3%	56.3%	19.2%	93.3%	61.5%	100.0%
Asian	61.0%	81.3%	49.3%	88.0%	78.4%	89.5%
Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	29.5%	45.0%	33.3%	69.2%	52.5%	100.0%
Other Race	23.5%	65.1%	0.0%	66.7%	60.0%	----
Two or More Races	28.8%	59.2%	23.2%	73.7%	63.6%	83.3%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	28.1%	51.5%	25.6%	71.9%	70.0%	59.3%
<i>Percent Renters</i>						
White	51.5%	26.7%	58.5%	16.6%	18.6%	25.1%
Black	87.4%	63.3%	84.1%	34.1%	62.5%	----
American Indian	66.7%	43.8%	80.8%	6.7%	38.5%	0.0%
Asian	39.0%	18.7%	50.7%	12.0%	21.6%	10.5%
Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	70.5%	55.0%	66.7%	30.8%	47.5%	0.0%
Other Race	76.5%	34.9%	100.0%	33.3%	40.0%	----
Two or More Races	71.2%	40.8%	76.8%	26.3%	36.4%	16.7%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	71.9%	48.5%	74.4%	28.1%	30.0%	40.7%

Source: Planning Department, 2010 Decennial Census Counts, Table QT-H1

Table II-9: Tenure by Race and Hispanic Origin, Alameda County, 2010

Ethnicity/Race	Owners	Renters
White	60.7%	39.3%
Black	32.4%	67.6%
American Indian	38.6%	61.4%
Asian	59.3%	40.7%
Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	44.0%	56.0%
Other Race	35.8%	64.2%
Two or More Races	40.1%	59.9%
Hispanic or Latino	41.9%	58.1%
County Average	53.4%	46.6%

Source: Planning Department, 2010 Decennial Census Counts, Table QT-H1

Educational Attainment

Educational attainment is an important indicator of income level and, therefore, ability to afford housing. A college education is a strong indicator of earning potential and the lack of one can potentially reduce income and limit housing opportunities. The percentage of the population that did not graduate from high school in Ashland, Cherryland and San Lorenzo are higher than in Alameda County (14%). Sunol is the only unincorporated CDP where the percentage of persons aged 25 and older with a graduate or professional degree exceeded the County average.

Table II-10: Educational Attainment of Persons 25 years and older, Alameda County and Unincorporated Communities, 2007-2011 Estimates

Place	Less than High School Diploma	Graduate or Professional Degree
Ashland CDP	27%	3%
Castro Valley CDP	9%	13%
Cherryland CDP	31%	5%
Fairview CDP	9%	13%
San Lorenzo CDP	20%	4%
Sunol CDP	6%	21%
Alameda County	14%	17%

Source: Planning Department, American Community Survey 5 year Estimates (2007-2011), Table B16010

Group Quarters

The U.S. Census Bureau defines group quarters as:

“a place where people live or stay, in a group living arrangement, that is owned or managed by an entity or organization providing housing and/or services for the residents...Group quarters include such places as college residence halls, residential treatment centers, skilled nursing facilities, group homes, military barracks, correctional facilities, and workers’ dormitories.”

The U.S. Census Bureau used a new methodology for counting group quarters in 2000 that missed or wrongly categorized millions of group homes and institutions. In 2010, the Census Bureau revised its methodology and definitions to more accurately count and categorize group homes. Therefore, the changes presented in Table II-11 may actually be due to the recategorization of some multifamily units as group homes.

In 2010, there were 2,370 persons living in group quarters. People in group quarters were most likely to be housed in nursing homes (1,010 or 43.0%) followed by persons in non-institutional group quarters (847 or 35.7%). According to the U.S. Census Bureau, non-institutional housing includes:

- Emergency and Transitional Shelters
- Group Homes Intended for Adults
- Residential Treatment Centers for Adults
- Religious Group Quarters

- Workers' Group Living Quarters and Job Corps Centers⁴

From 2000 to 2010, the number of persons housed in "Correctional Institutions" increased from 0 to 304 persons. The change is likely due to the construction of the new Juvenile Hall on the Alameda County Fairmont Campus. Consequently, persons in correctional institutions accounted for 12.8 percent of the group quarters population in 2010. There are no emergency shelters in Unincorporated Alameda County.

Table II-11: Group Quarters Population, 2000-2010

Type	2000	2010	2000-2010		Percent of Total (2010)
			Absolute Change	Percent Change	
<i>Institutional</i>					
Correctional Institutions	0	304	304	----	12.8%
Nursing Homes	1,010	1,019	9	0.9%	43.0%
Other Institutions	787	200	-587	-74.6%	8.4%
<i>Noninstitutional</i>					
College Dormitories (Includes College Quarters Off Campus)	0	0	0	----	0.0%
Military Quarters	0	0	0	----	0.0%
Other Noninstitutional Group Quarters	879	847	-32	-3.6%	35.7%
Total Group Quarters Population	2,676	2,370	-306	-11.4%	100.0%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Table II-12 provides data which is grouped by place. Castro Valley has the majority of persons in group quarters overall. However, Cherryland has the largest number of persons living in non-institutional housing.

⁴ U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 American Community Survey/Puerto Rico Community Survey Group Quarters Definitions.
https://www.census.gov/acs/www/Downloads/data_documentation/GroupDefinitions/2010GQ_Definitions.pdf

Table II-12: Group Quarters Population by Place, 2010

Place	Total Population	Total Population - In Group Quarters		Institutionalized Population		Noninstitutionalized Population		Percent of Total Group Quarters Population (2010)
		#	%	#	%	#	%	
Ashland	21,925	186	0.8%	83	0.4%	103	0.5%	7.8%
Castro Valley	61,388	1,204	2.0%	932	1.5%	272	0.4%	50.8%
Cherryland	14,728	456	3.1%	179	1.2%	277	1.9%	19.2%
Fairview	10,003	151	1.5%	67	0.7%	84	0.8%	6.4%
San Lorenzo	23,452	67	0.3%	----	0.0%	67	0.3%	2.8%
Sunol	913	----	0.0%	----	0.0%	----	0.0%	0.0%
Remainder	8,857	306	3.5%	262	3.0%	44	0.5%	12.9%
TOTAL	141,266	2,370	1.7%	1,523	1.1%	847	0.6%	100.0%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013, US Census Bureau, 2010 Decennial Census, Table DP-1

GENERAL HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Households and Household Size

Data from the United States Census contained in Table II-13 shows that there were 48,516 households in Unincorporated Alameda County in 2010, a number relatively unchanged from 2000. A household consists of all the people who occupy a housing unit, including the related family members and all the unrelated people, if any, such as lodgers, foster children, wards, or employees who share the housing unit. A person living alone in a housing unit, or a group of unrelated people sharing a housing unit such as partners or roomers, is also counted as a household. In the unincorporated CDPs, Fairview had the largest percentage increase at 6 percent, followed by Castro Valley at more than 3 percent. Sunol's decline in population is most likely attributable to the change in the boundaries of the CDP which occurred between 2000 and 2010.

Table II-13: Household Growth in Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland, Fairview, San Lorenzo, Sunol and Remaining Unincorporated Areas, 2000-2010

Place	2000	2010	2000-2010	
			Absolute Change	Percent Change
Ashland CDP	7,223	7,270	47	0.65%
Castro Valley CDP	21,606	22,348	742	3.43%
Cherryland CDP	4,658	4,643	-15	-0.32%
Fairview CDP	3,281	3,490	209	6.37%
San Lorenzo CDP	7,500	7,425	-75	-1.00%
Sunol CDP	483	362	-121	-25.05%
Remainder	3,778	2,978	-800	-21.18%
TOTAL	48,529	48,516	-13	-0.03%

Source: Planning Department, US Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts, Table DP-1

Table II-14 shows the projected household populations of each jurisdiction within Alameda County in 2020, 2030, and 2040. Consistent with population data in Table II-1, Unincorporated Alameda County represents approximately nine percent of the County's total households. In Unincorporated Alameda County, the household population is expected to increase from 48,516 persons in 2010 to 54,590 persons in 2040. The cities of Dublin and Emeryville are projected to have the largest increases over that period. According to ABAG, household growth in Unincorporated Alameda County is expected to average approximately 4 percent a year.

Table II-14: Household Growth in Alameda County by Jurisdiction, 2010-2040

Jurisdiction	Number of Households				Percent Change		
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2010-20	2020-30	2030-40
Alameda County	545,138	598,430	651,720	705,330	9.8%	8.9%	8.2%
Alameda	30,123	32,270	34,410	36,570	7.1%	6.6%	6.3%
Albany	7,401	7,840	8,290	8,740	5.9%	5.7%	5.4%
Berkeley	46,029	49,350	52,660	55,980	7.2%	6.7%	6.3%
Dublin	14,913	17,800	20,690	23,610	19.4%	16.2%	14.1%
Emeryville	5,694	7,660	9,630	11,620	34.5%	25.7%	20.7%
Fremont	71,004	77,030	83,050	89,090	8.5%	7.8%	7.3%
Hayward	45,365	49,860	54,350	58,850	9.9%	9.0%	8.3%
Livermore	29,134	32,390	35,650	38,940	11.2%	10.1%	9.2%
Newark	12,972	14,190	15,410	16,640	9.4%	8.6%	8.0%
Oakland	153,791	173,270	192,790	212,470	12.7%	11.3%	10.2%
Piedmont	3,801	3,850	3,880	3,890	1.3%	0.8%	0.3%
Pleasanton	25,245	27,590	29,940	32,300	9.3%	8.5%	7.9%
San Leandro	30,717	33,270	35,820	38,390	8.3%	7.7%	7.2%
Union City	20,433	21,520	22,590	23,650	5.3%	5.0%	4.7%
Unincorporated	48,516	50,540	52,560	54,590	4.2%	4.0%	3.9%

Source: ABAG Projections 2013

Household size influences the demand for the mix of multifamily and single-family homes, as well as the size of the units. Average household size is an important indicator because it helps identify whether more or fewer people are living together in housing. When the number of persons per household rises, it can be an indicator of increased fertility rates, people “doubling up” in order to cut housing costs, or the influx of immigrant families, many of whom have large or extended families. According to data obtained from the US Census, from 2000 and 2010, and with the exceptions of Sunol and Fairview, all unincorporated neighborhoods had increases of more than 4 percent in household size. Change in the average household size of the entire County was negligible.

Table II-15: Average Household Sizes by Place, 2000-2010

Place	2000	2010	2000-2010	
			Absolute Change	Percent Change
Ashland CDP	2.83	2.99	0.16	6%
Castro Valley CDP	2.58	2.69	0.11	4%
Cherryland CDP	2.87	3.07	0.20	7%
Fairview CDP	2.84	2.82	-0.02	-1%
San Lorenzo CDP	2.92	3.15	0.23	8%
Sunol CDP	2.76	2.52	-0.26	-9%
Alameda County	2.71	2.70	-0.01	0%

Source: Planning Department, US Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts, Table DP-1

Table II-16 provides data on the number of persons per household in Unincorporated Alameda County in 2010. Approximately 50 percent of all households have one or two persons.

Table II-16: Number of Persons in Household, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2010

Persons in Household	Number	Percent
1-Person	10,358	21%
2-Person	14,303	29%
3-Person	8,945	18%
4-Person	7,734	16%
5-Person	3,988	8%
6-Person	1,713	4%
7+Person	1,475	3%
TOTAL	48,516	100%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Table II-17 compares the number and percentages of households by composition between Alameda County as a whole and the unincorporated communities. In both cases, families, with or without children, are the largest share of households, followed by single persons, and non-family housing arrangements. Non-family housing arrangements include persons in group quarters, and other non-related persons residing in the same residence.

Table II-17: Household Composition, 2007-2011 Estimates

	Alameda County		Unincorporated	
	Households	Percent	Households	Percent
Single Person	148,666	27.7%	10,648	22.4%
Family, No Kids	160,814	30.0%	16,303	34.4%
Family With Kids	183,725	34.3%	17,743	37.4%
Non-Family	42,955	8.0%	2,751	5.8%
TOTAL	536,160	100.0%	47,445	100.0%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Housing Tenure

The most recent data available regarding housing tenure (ownership rates vs. rental rates) in the Unincorporated County comes from the Census 2010. In 2010, 53.4 percent of the County's households were renters, while the remaining 46.6 percent were owners. The City of Alameda was the only jurisdiction to not see a decline in home ownership. Union City had the largest decline (-4.8%).

Table II-18: Tenure by Jurisdiction, Alameda County, 2000 and 2010

Jurisdiction	2000		2010		Difference in Ownership Rate (2000 to 2010)
	Renters	Owners	Renters	Owners	
Alameda County	45.3%	54.7%	46.6%	53.4%	-1.3%
Alameda	52.1%	47.9%	51.9%	48.1%	0.2%
Albany	49.4%	50.6%	51.7%	48.3%	-2.3%
Berkeley	57.3%	42.7%	59.1%	40.9%	-1.8%
Dublin	35.1%	64.9%	36.8%	63.2%	-1.7%
Emeryville	62.9%	37.1%	64.6%	35.4%	-1.8%
Fremont	35.5%	64.5%	37.4%	62.6%	-1.9%
Hayward	46.8%	53.2%	47.2%	52.8%	-0.4%
Livermore	27.8%	72.2%	30.0%	70.0%	-2.1%
Newark	29.4%	70.6%	31.1%	68.9%	-1.7%
Oakland	58.6%	41.4%	58.9%	41.1%	-0.4%
Piedmont	9.3%	90.7%	11.7%	88.3%	-2.3%
Pleasanton	26.6%	73.4%	29.1%	70.9%	-2.5%
San Leandro	39.4%	60.6%	42.5%	57.5%	-3.1%
Union City	28.7%	71.3%	33.5%	66.5%	-4.8%
Unincorporated	36.7%	63.3%	39.2%	60.8%	-2.5%

Source: Planning Department, US Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts, Table DP-1

In 2010, the unincorporated neighborhoods saw a higher percentage of owner-occupied housing than the County as a whole (60.8% vs. 53.4%). Unincorporated communities as a whole also had higher levels of owner-occupied housing in 2000. Of the unincorporated communities, Ashland and the County remainder had the highest percentage of renter-occupied housing. At 65.5 and 74.6 percent respectively, they were the only communities where the percentage of renters exceeded the County average. The following table shows the percentages of renters vs. owners by area of Unincorporated Alameda County from the Census 2000 and 2010.

Table II-19: Tenure by Place, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000 and 2010

Place	2000		2010		Difference in Ownership Rate (2000 to 2010)
	Renters	Owners	Renters	Owners	
Ashland CDP	64.1%	35.9%	65.5%	34.5%	-1.4%
Castro Valley CDP	30.3%	69.7%	31.0%	69.0%	-0.7%
Cherryland CDP	37.5%	62.5%	31.4%	68.6%	6.1%
Fairview CDP	16.4%	83.6%	22.0%	78.0%	-5.6%
San Lorenzo CDP	20.8%	79.2%	25.0%	75.0%	-4.2%
Sunol CDP	24.6%	75.4%	24.9%	75.1%	-0.3%
Remainder	62.9%	37.1%	74.6%	25.4%	-11.7%
Unincorporated	36.7%	63.3%	39.2%	60.8%	-2.5%
Alameda County	45.3%	54.7%	46.6%	53.4%	-1.3%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013, US Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts, Table DP-1

Income Characteristics

Income directly affects the range of housing costs and influences housing affordability. Household income is also directly related to housing tenure (owner or renter occupied) and type. As household income increases, the ratio of homeownership tends to increase. Household income is an important consideration when evaluating housing and community development because a lower income typically constrains a household’s ability to secure adequate housing or services. While housing choices, such as tenure (owning versus renting) and location of residences are very much income-dependent, household size and type often affect the proportion of income that can be spent on housing.

Much of the focus of the Housing Element is on the needs of households by income level. Incomes are defined as a percentage of the median income for the Oakland Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA), comprising Alameda and Contra Costa counties. Five categories are typically used to compare incomes. These categories are:

- Extremely Low Income: 0-30 percent Area Median Income (AMI)
- Very Low Income: 31-50 percent AMI
- Low Income: 51-80 percent AMI
- Moderate Income: 81-120 percent AMI
- Above Moderate Income: greater than 120 percent AMI

Table II-20 shows the dollar thresholds for these income levels by household size according to HUD’s 2014 income guidelines. These guidelines are used by most agencies for determining eligibility for participation in various government programs and are updated annually.

Table II-20: 2014 HUD Income Limits for the Oakland PMSA

Persons in Household	Extremely Low (30% AMI)	Very Low (50% AMI)	Low (80% AMI)	Median (100% AMI)	Moderate (120% AMI)
1	\$19,350	\$32,200	\$47,350	\$64,400	\$77,400
2	\$22,100	\$36,800	\$54,100	\$73,600	\$88,400
3	\$24,850	\$41,400	\$60,850	\$82,800	\$99,400
4	\$27,600	\$46,000	\$67,600	\$92,000	\$110,400
5	\$29,850	\$49,700	\$73,050	\$99,400	\$119,400
6	\$32,050	\$53,400	\$78,450	\$106,800	\$128,200
7	\$34,250	\$57,050	\$83,850	\$114,100	\$137,000
8	\$36,450	\$60,750	\$89,250	\$121,500	\$145,800

Source: Planning Department, HUD User Data

Table II-21 shows household income by tenure based on the Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) data prepared by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) using Census data. According to the CHAS data, approximately 39 percent of the County's households could be classified as having lower incomes and 61 percent had moderate or above moderate incomes in 2010. Lower-income households are disproportionately renters (57%) rather than owners (43%).

Table II-21: Income Level by Tenure, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2007-2011

Income Level	Owner		Renter		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extremely Low <30% of AMI	1,840	6.6%	3,635	21.9%	5,475	12.3%
Very Low 30 to 50% of AMI	2,100	7.5%	3,015	18.1%	5,115	11.5%
Low 50 to 80% of AMI	3,575	12.8%	3,384	20.4%	6,959	15.6%
Moderate 80 to 100% of AMI	3,070	11.0%	2,050	12.3%	5,120	11.5%
Above Moderate 100%+ of AMI	17,430	62.2%	4,540	27.3%	21,970	49.2%
TOTAL	28,010	100.0%	16,615	100.0%	44,630	100.0%

Source: Planning Department, CHAS (2007-2011)

The most recent information available on the unincorporated neighborhoods (place level data) for income comes from Census 2010. The median household income for Alameda County in 2010 was \$70,821. In 2010, Fairview had the highest median income at \$88,288 and Ashland has the lowest at \$48,026 of all the Unincorporated areas. Table II-22 compares incomes from each of the unincorporated area neighborhoods against the County-wide median income.

Table II-22: 2007-2011 Alameda County Median Household Income Compared to the Median Income of Unincorporated CDPs

Place	Median Income	% of County Median Income
Alameda County	\$70,821	100%
Ashland CDP	\$48,026	68%
Castro Valley CDP	\$82,370	116%
Cherryland CDP	\$50,987	72%
Fairview CDP	\$85,288	120%
San Lorenzo CDP	\$73,053	103%
Sunol CDP	\$72,656	103%

Source: Planning Department, American Community Survey 5 year Estimates (2007-2011), Table S1903

Table II-23 provides information on the income levels of families in each unincorporated CDP. Ashland and Cherryland have the greatest percentages of extremely low, very low and low income households. This data illustrates that there is a significant income gap between Ashland and Cherryland and the other communities within unincorporated Alameda County. Moreover, this data is consistent with data from the previous Housing Element indicating that there is an ongoing need for both economic development and affordable housing within those communities.

Table II-23: Income Level within Unincorporated CDPs

Income Level	Ashland	Castro Valley	Cherryland	Fairview	San Lorenzo	Sunol
Extremely Low <30% of AMI	20.8%	8.9%	20.4%	7.6%	11.6%	6.4%
Very Low 30 to 50% of AMI	16.3%	9.5%	16.7%	7.9%	11.1%	12.7%
Low 50 to 80% of AMI	20.7%	13.5%	19.1%	11.7%	16.9%	10.8%
Moderate 80 to 100% of AMI	14.8%	10.4%	9.4%	13.8%	12.0%	12.7%
Above Moderate 100%+ of AMI	28.0%	57.7%	34.6%	59.2%	48.4%	57.1%

Source: Planning Department, CHAS Data (2007-2011)

Inflation may be defined as a sustained increase in the general price level of goods and services in an economy over time. When prices rise, each dollar buys fewer goods and services. In the United States inflation is calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), and is known as the Consumer Price Index (CPI). In calculating the CPI, the BLS collects data on the prices of goods and services from various locations throughout the U.S. By using the CPI data one can, for example, determine the value of a dollar in 2014 as compared to 1975. When adjusted for inflation, the 1999 median income of \$55,946 is equal to \$75,537 in 2011 dollars. Therefore, median household income actually decreased from 2000 to 2011 in Alameda County when adjusted for inflation. The same is true for all unincorporated CDPs. This indicates that while incomes have increased, they have not kept pace with the increases in the actual costs of goods and services. The data is provided in the table below.

Table II-24: Alameda County Median Household Income and Inflation, 2000-2011

Jurisdiction	2000 Median Income (1999 dollars)	2000 Median Income (2011 dollars)	2007-2011 Median Income (2011 dollars)	Percent Change (2000 to 2011)
Alameda County	\$55,946	\$75,537	\$70,821	-6.2%
Ashland CDP	\$40,811	\$55,102	\$48,026	-12.8%
Castro Valley CDP	\$64,874	\$87,591	\$82,370	-6.0%
Cherryland CDP	\$42,880	\$57,895	\$50,987	-11.9%
Fairview CDP	\$76,647	\$103,486	\$85,288	-17.6%
San Lorenzo CDP	\$56,170	\$75,839	\$73,053	-3.7%
Sunol CDP	\$88,353	\$119,291	\$72,656	-39.1%

Sources: Planning Department, US Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census Counts (Table P053) and American Community Survey 5 year Estimates (2007-2011), Table S1903, Inflation Calculator, Bureau of Labor Statistics http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm.

Table II-25 has an analysis of household income by quartile. Data compiled by ABAG, taken from the American Community Survey and 2000 Census, shows that the number of households with total incomes below \$100,000 decreased; however, the number of households with incomes over \$100,000 increased. There are a number of possible explanations for the increase in the number of households with incomes over \$100,000, they include: increase salaries or earnings; multiple persons residing in a single domicile (most likely extended families) and pooling their resources; and/or lower-income households moving out of the area due to the increasing cost of living in the Bay Area, combined with an influx of higher income persons. Combined with the data in Table II-24, they show that while household incomes have made gains, when inflation is taken into consideration, incomes have actually declined.

Table II-25: Household Income by Quartile, Unincorporated Alameda County vs. Alameda County as Whole, 2000-2011

		2000		2007-2011		Difference	
		County	Uninc.	County	Uninc.	County	Uninc.
Total Households		523,787	48,642	536,160	47,445	12,373	-1,197
<i>Less than \$ 24,999</i>	Number	110,952	8,454	97,829	7,232	-13,123	-1,222
	Percent	21.2%	17.4%	18.2%	15.2%	-2.9%	-2.1%
<i>\$ 25,000 to \$ 49,999</i>	Number	121,984	12,246	96,437	9,591	-25,547	-2,655
	Percent	23.3%	25.2%	18.0%	20.2%	-5.3%	-5.0%
<i>\$ 50,000 to \$ 74,999</i>	Number	103,553	10,591	87,039	8,772	-16,514	-1,819
	Percent	19.8%	21.8%	16.2%	18.5%	-3.5%	-3.3%
<i>\$ 75,000 to \$ 99,999</i>	Number	70,947	7,281	66,324	6,178	-4,623	-1,103
	Percent	13.5%	15.0%	12.4%	13.0%	-1.2%	-1.9%
<i>\$ 100,000 or more</i>	Number	116,351	10,070	188,531	15,672	72,180	5,602
	Percent	22.2%	20.7%	35.2%	33.0%	12.9%	12.3%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Poverty thresholds are the dollar amounts used by the U.S. Census Bureau to determine poverty status. Each person or family is assigned one out of 48 possible poverty

thresholds which vary according to the size of the family and the ages of the members. The same thresholds are used throughout the United States. Poverty thresholds are updated annually for inflation by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, using the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (CPI-U). Although the poverty thresholds in some sense reflect families' needs, they are intended for use as a statistical yardstick, not as a complete description of what people and families need to live.

The Department of Health and Human Services also issues Poverty Guidelines that are the other version of the federal poverty measure. These guidelines are a simplification of the poverty thresholds used for administrative purposes, i.e., determining financial eligibility for certain federal programs. They also vary by family size.

The dollar thresholds used by the Federal government vary for household size and composition, but not by region, and tend to understate the true extent of poverty in high cost areas such as the San Francisco Bay area.

The poverty rate is a relative measure of financial well-being. The poverty rate measures the proportion of the population whose income falls below the poverty thresholds established by the U.S Census Bureau. Poverty, as evidenced by the data below, has increased from 2000 to 2011. With the exception of Berkeley, all communities saw the percentage of persons living in poverty in their communities increase. This is likely due to the Recession of 2007-2009 which precipitated large increases in unemployment. In 2000 and 2011, the poverty rate in Unincorporated Alameda County was below the County average; however, when we look at data by community and age group, such as in Table II-26, more information emerges.

Table II-26: Alameda County Poverty Rate, 2000-2011

Jurisdiction	Poverty Rate (2000)	Poverty Rate (2007-11)	Difference
Alameda County	11.0%	11.8%	0.8%
Alameda	8.2%	10.1%	1.9%
Albany	7.9%	8.5%	0.6%
Berkeley	20.0%	18.3%	-1.7%
Dublin	2.9%	3.5%	0.6%
Emeryville	13.2%	14.0%	0.8%
Fremont	5.4%	5.4%	0.0%
Hayward	10.0%	12.8%	2.8%
Livermore	5.3%	6.0%	0.7%
Newark	5.5%	6.4%	0.9%
Oakland	19.4%	19.6%	0.2%
Piedmont	2.0%	2.5%	0.5%
Pleasanton	2.6%	4.2%	1.6%
San Leandro	6.4%	9.9%	3.5%
Union City	6.5%	7.7%	1.2%
Unincorporated	7.4%	10.2%	2.8%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Table II-27 shows that children (persons under age 18) are more likely than any other age group to live in poverty. This means that in 2011, the annual income of the households in which they

lived was less than \$50,059 (nine or more persons) or \$22,811⁶ for a family of four (two adults and two children). In comparing all of the unincorporated communities, we see that Cherryland, with 21 percent of persons below the poverty level in 2011, has the highest percentage of persons living in poverty. Moreover, approximately 1 in 4 children reside in homes with incomes below the poverty level. The picture for persons 18 and older is more varied. The numbers of persons classified as “seniors” or “elderly” were generally no more or less likely than other adults to live in poverty.

Table II-27: Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months by Age, Unincorporated CDPs, 2007-2011

Place	Description	Persons	Age		
			Under 18 years	18 to 64 years	65 years and over
Ashland CDP	Population with data	21,732	6,236	13,758	1,738
	Below poverty level	3,613	1,493	1,843	277
	% below poverty level	16.6%	23.9%	13.4%	15.9%
Castro Valley CDP	Population with data	59,953	13,537	38,267	8,149
	Below poverty level	4,143	1,124	2,384	635
	% below poverty level	6.9%	8.3%	6.2%	7.8%
Cherryland CDP	Population with data	14,009	4,181	8,947	881
	Below poverty level	2,973	1,070	1,789	114
	% below poverty level	21.2%	25.6%	20.0%	12.9%
Fairview CDP	Population with data	9,485	1,748	6,320	1,417
	Below poverty level	619	174	348	97
	% below poverty level	6.5%	10.0%	5.5%	6.8%
San Lorenzo CDP	Population with data	24,015	5,738	15,067	3,210
	Below poverty level	1,820	414	1,213	193
	% below poverty level	7.6%	7.2%	8.1%	6.0%
Sunol CDP	Population with data	760	121	502	137
	Below poverty level	28	0	21	7
	% below poverty level	3.7%	0.0%	4.2%	5.1%

Source: Planning Department, American Community Survey 5 year Estimates (2007-2011), Table S1701

Self Sufficiency Standard

The self-sufficiency standard (SSS) is a measure used to estimate the costs of living that families of different sizes must meet to move out of poverty. It is calculated annually by Insight Center for Community Economic Development. It calculates the amount of money working adults need to meet their basic needs without subsidies of any kind. Unlike the federal poverty standard, this standard takes into account the costs of living as they vary both by family types and geographic location.

The SSS calculation includes childcare, food, transportation, medical care, clothing and miscellaneous, taxes and tax credits. Calculating the level of wages that will be necessary for families in different locales to survive can assist policymakers and others in designing welfare policies and workforce development programs. This standard can be used to assess whether

⁶ U.S. Census Bureau, Poverty Thresholds by Size of Family and Number of Children, 2011

welfare employment training programs increase recipients' earnings enough to create a path out of poverty. It can also help policy makers understand the impact of eliminating support services such as childcare subsidies, transportation or MediCal.

The SSS for the Oakland Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA) for 2013 shows that a hypothetical single parent household with an infant and a preschool-age child would need to earn more than \$35 per hour in order to afford the cost of living in the East Bay without government subsidy. This translates into approximately \$75,000 per year for a family of three. The following table highlights the income needed for various family types for the Oakland PMSA.

Table II-28: Self-Sufficiency Wage, Oakland PMSA, 2013

Family Composition	Household Size	Self-Sufficiency Wage		
		Hourly	Monthly	Annually
Adult	1	\$13.00	\$2,288	\$27,456
Adult + Infant	2	\$24.63	\$4,335	\$52,023
Adult + Pre-school	2	\$25.56	\$4,499	\$53,990
Adult + Teenage	2	\$17.42	\$3,065	\$36,783
Adult + Infant + Pre-school	3	\$35.38	\$6,227	\$74,724
Adult + Infant + Pre-school + Teenage	4	\$41.83	\$7,363	\$88,355
2 Adults + Infant + Pre-school	4	\$18.67	\$6,572	\$78,858
2 Adults + Pre-school + Teenage	4	\$14.81	\$5,215	\$62,576

Source: Insight Center for Community Economic Development, 2013

Employment Trends

The State Employment Development Department (EDD) provides projections of jobs by industry, occupational title, and type. Included are estimates of earnings by occupation. Jobs data can be used to extrapolate household income, which can then be used to assist in predicting housing affordability. Table II-29 indicates that from 2010-2020 “Professional and Business Services” are projected to have the largest share of growth at 26.7 percent. “Construction” will experience the largest percentage (or relative increase) of job growth during that period. The EDD forecasts that East Bay employment will grow 15.1 percent from 2010 to 2020 to over 1.2 million jobs. As economic growth persists over time and firms become more confident about the long-run health of the economy, higher-skilled sectors will begin to take on more permanent employees at a faster rate. The result is that by the end of 2020, many higher-skilled sectors are expected to have matched, or surpassed, the overall rates of growth in lower-wage sectors.

Table II-30 shows that “Software Developers, Applications” will see the most growth of any occupational title. “Software Developers, Applications” along with their counterpart “Software Developers, Systems Software” had among the highest median annual incomes in 2012 (\$102,242 and \$108,211 respectively). These projections are consistent with those from other non-governmental sources that technology jobs are seeing resurgence in the Bay Area. Likewise when looking for references to the construction or land development, there are a number of occupations related to that field including: plasterers, urban and regional planners, and operating engineers. In 2012, occupations which may be considered related to

development have incomes which range from \$42,549 (Hazardous Materials Removal Workers) to \$84,813 for Urban and Regional Planners. In total, this data indicates that employment growth will occur at all income levels, affirming the need for housing at all levels of affordability.

Table II-29: 2010-2020 Industry Employment Projections, Oakland-Fremont-Hayward MD, (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties)

Industry Title	Annual Average Employment		Employment Change		% of Total growth
	2010	2020	Difference	Percent	
Total Employment	1,047,600	1,206,200	158,600	15.1%	100.0%
Mining and Logging	1,200	1,300	100	8.3%	0.1%
Construction	47,400	61,100	13,700	28.9%	8.6%
Manufacturing	79,700	83,400	3,700	4.6%	2.3%
Wholesale Trade	41,800	45,300	3,500	8.4%	2.2%
Retail Trade	100,300	116,900	16,600	16.6%	10.5%
Transportation, Warehousing, and Utilities	31,500	36,700	5,200	16.5%	3.3%
Information	23,600	24,300	700	3.0%	0.4%
Financial Activities	48,200	56,300	8,100	16.8%	5.1%
Professional and Business Services	152,100	192,000	39,900	26.2%	25.2%
Education Services, Health Care and Social Assistance	136,400	159,000	22,600	16.6%	14.2%
Leisure and Hospitality	85,800	104,400	18,600	21.7%	11.7%
Other Services	35,000	38,900	3,900	11.1%	2.5%
Government	165,300	178,200	12,900	7.8%	8.1%
Total Nonfarm	948,300	1,097,800	149,500	15.8%	94.3%
Total Farm	1,400	1,600	200	14.3%	0.1%
Self Employment ⁽¹⁾	78,600	85,100	6,500	8.3%	4.1%
Unpaid Family Workers ⁽²⁾	700	700	0	0.0%	0.0%
Private Household Workers ⁽³⁾	18,600	21,000	2,400	12.9%	1.5%

Source: Planning Department, State Employment Development Department, August 27, 2012

Notes:

- (1) Self-Employed persons work for profit or fees in their own business, profession, trade, or farm. Only the unincorporated self-employed are included in this category. The estimated and projected employment numbers include all workers who are primarily self-employed and wage and salary workers who hold a secondary job as a self-employed worker.
- (2) Unpaid family workers are those persons who work without pay for 15 or more hours per week on a farm or in a business operated by a member of the household to whom they are related by birth or marriage.
- (3) Private Household Workers are employed as domestic workers whose primary activities are to maintain the household. Industry employment is based on QCEW.

Table II-30: 2010-2020 Fastest Growing Occupations, Oakland-Fremont-Hayward MD, (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties)

Occupational Title	Annual Average Employment		Employment Change	2012 First Quarter Wages	
	2010	2020	Percent	Median Hourly	Median Annual
Software Developers, Applications	7,180	9,560	33.1%	\$ 49.15	\$ 102,242
Environmental Engineers	640	830	29.7%	\$ 49.20	\$ 102,341
Plasterers and Stucco Masons	520	670	28.8%	\$ 29.05	\$ 60,423
Urban and Regional Planners	1,000	1,280	28.0%	\$ 40.77	\$ 84,813
Software Developers, Systems Software	3,940	5,040	27.9%	\$ 52.03	\$ 108,211
Environmental Science and Protection Technicians, Including Health	400	510	27.5%	\$ 25.82	\$ 53,700
Merchandise Displayers and Window Trimmers	1,300	1,650	26.9%	\$ 12.79	\$ 26,604
Food Service Managers	3,370	4,270	26.7%	\$ 24.57	\$ 51,087
Environmental Scientists and Specialists, Including Health	1,130	1,430	26.5%	\$ 37.39	\$ 77,782
Dental Laboratory Technicians	490	620	26.5%	\$ 18.95	\$ 39,433
Sheet Metal Workers	1,210	1,520	25.6%	\$ 28.67	\$ 59,624
Computer Programmers	3,710	4,660	25.6%	\$ 43.65	\$ 90,801
Structural Iron and Steel Workers	560	700	25.0%	\$ 33.79	\$ 70,295
Hazardous Materials Removal Workers	960	1,200	25.0%	\$ 20.45	\$ 42,549
Management Analysts	5,510	6,850	24.3%	\$ 45.18	\$ 93,965
Occupational Health and Safety Specialists	580	720	24.1%	\$ 46.61	\$ 96,947
Plumbers, Pipefitters, and Steamfitters	2,460	3,050	24.0%	\$ 29.31	\$ 60,976
Market Research Analysts and Marketing Specialists	4,280	5,300	23.8%	\$ 38.35	\$ 79,777
Operating Engineers and Other Construction Equipment Operators	2,290	2,830	23.6%	\$ 34.60	\$ 71,977
First-Line Supervisors of Construction Trades and Extraction Workers	3,810	4,690	23.1%	\$ 39.88	\$ 82,945

Source: State Employment Development Department, September 2, 2012

According to Beacon Economics, employment has steadily grown in the East Bay since mid-2010, as East Bay businesses hire more employees almost every month, and as more and more East Bay residents find work in the East Bay and elsewhere. East Bay residents are finding work at a faster pace than East Bay businesses are adding new workers. Lower-skilled employment sectors have seen some of the biggest job growth in the East Bay in recent years. Some of these sectors, such as Administrative Support and Leisure and Hospitality, employ many part-time and temporary workers. Employment in the Construction sector is increasing quickly, in turn, up 9.9% from March 2012 to March 2013. As firms have begun to ramp up construction, labor demand is increasing rapidly as a result. Given these trends that will likely put pressure on the housing market, it will be important to encourage the development of affordable housing for low wage workers and strengthen rental protections for existing residents. In addition, because many residents commute outside of the East Bay for work, development that is convenient and accessible to transit should be prioritized.

The table below (Table II-31) contains employment projections by occupational type. It too affirms the ongoing need for housing at varying levels of affordability. Although a significant number of new jobs are expected to be created in the next few years, a large portion of them will be in low-wage service occupations. Office, retail and food service jobs employ the largest numbers of people within the metropolitan area, and they occupy the bottom half of all occupations in terms of pay locally.

Table II-31: 2010-2020 Occupational Employment Projections, Oakland-Fremont-Hayward MD, (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties)

Occupation Type	Annual Average Employment		Employment Change		2012 First Quarter Wages	
	2010	2020	Total	Percent	Median Hourly	Median Annual
Total, All Occupations	1,047,600	1,206,200	158,600	15.1%	\$ 22.29	\$ 46,353
Management Occupations	70,350	81,350	11,000	15.6%	\$ 54.53	\$ 113,429
Legal Occupations	8,630	10,030	1,400	16.2%	\$ 47.16	\$ 98,088
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical Occupations	57,420	65,480	8,060	14.0%	\$ 45.37	\$ 94,381
Architecture and Engineering Occupations	29,530	34,160	4,630	15.7%	\$ 43.77	\$ 91,045
Computer and Mathematical Occupations	37,990	46,570	8,580	22.6%	\$ 43.50	\$ 90,477
Life, Physical, and Social Science Occupations	17,000	19,990	2,990	17.6%	\$ 36.50	\$ 75,912
Business and Financial Operations Occupations	59,240	68,660	9,420	15.9%	\$ 36.02	\$ 74,930
Construction and Extraction Occupations	48,410	58,720	10,310	21.3%	\$ 28.41	\$ 59,096
Education, Training, and Library Occupations	70,680	81,730	11,050	15.6%	\$ 25.93	\$ 53,931
Installation, Maintenance, and Repair Occupations	36,180	39,690	3,510	9.7%	\$ 24.93	\$ 51,848
Community and Social Service Occupations	17,470	19,950	2,480	14.2%	\$ 24.18	\$ 50,299

Occupation Type	Annual Average Employment		Employment Change		2012 First Quarter Wages	
	2010	2020	Total	Percent	Median Hourly	Median Annual
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media Occupations	19,850	22,820	2,970	15.0%	\$ 23.77	\$ 49,433
Protective Service Occupations	20,130	22,530	2,400	11.9%	\$ 22.64	\$ 47,072
Office and Administrative Support Occupations	159,620	181,720	22,100	13.8%	\$ 19.64	\$ 40,843
Production Occupations	49,350	52,970	3,620	7.3%	\$ 16.62	\$ 34,571
Transportation and Material Moving Occupations	58,700	67,770	9,070	15.5%	\$ 16.18	\$ 33,644
Healthcare Support Occupations	27,430	31,280	3,850	14.0%	\$ 16.05	\$ 33,371
Sales and Related Occupations	104,420	117,920	13,500	12.9%	\$ 15.56	\$ 32,352
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance Occupations	31,730	36,510	4,780	15.1%	\$ 14.12	\$ 29,365
Personal Care and Service Occupations	47,090	53,360	6,270	13.3%	\$ 11.18	\$ 23,241
Farming, Fishing, and Forestry Occupations	1,560	1,850	290	18.6%	\$ 10.43	\$ 21,702
Food Preparation and Serving Related Occupations	74,720	91,070	16,350	21.9%	\$ 9.48	\$ 19,709

Source: State Employment Development Department, September 28, 2012

According to the 2010 Census, the largest employment sectors within Unincorporated Alameda County were Educational, Health and Social Services (21%), Professional and Related Services (12%), followed by the Retail Trade (11%) and Manufacturing (11% combined of durable non-durable goods).

Table II-32: Unincorporated Alameda County Worker by Industry, 2000-2011

Industry	2000		2007-2011 ACS 5-year Estimates	
	Total	Percent	Total	Percent
Employed civilian population 16 years and over	65,273	100%	64,947	100%
Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, and mining	333	1%	277	0%
Construction	5,107	8%	5,449	8%
Manufacturing	8,065	12%	6,913	11%
Wholesale trade	3,062	5%	2,695	4%
Retail trade	8,297	13%	7,020	11%
Transportation and warehousing, and utilities	4,678	7%	4,175	6%
Information	2,444	4%	1,710	3%
Finance, insurance, real estate, and rental and leasing	4,732	7%	4,267	7%
Professional, scientific, management, administrative, and waste management services	8,177	13%	7,768	12%
Educational, health, and social services	10,914	17%	13,396	21%
Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services	3,615	6%	4,809	7%
Other services (except public administration)	3,329	5%	3,622	6%
Public administration	2,520	4%	2,846	4%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

According to the ABAG Projections 2013, a total of 132,330 new jobs are anticipated to be created in Alameda County between 2010 and 2020, as shown in Table II-33 below. The largest job growth is expected in Oakland (43,140 jobs), followed by Fremont (16,530 jobs). Unincorporated Alameda County is expected to gain 4,760 jobs. During this period, the highest growth rate is projected in the Cities of Dublin (43.4%), Emeryville (25.0%), and Oakland (22.6%).

By 2020, 61 percent of all jobs in the County are projected to be located in the Cities of Berkeley, Hayward, Fremont and Oakland. Oakland alone is projected to account for 28 percent of Alameda County jobs.

Table II-33: Jobs – Current and Forecasted, Alameda County (2010-2040)

Jurisdiction	Jobs				Percent Change		
	2010	2020	2030	2040	2010-20	2020-30	2030-40
Alameda County	694,460	826,790	875,390	947,650	19.1%	5.9%	8.3%
Alameda	24,070	28,770	30,590	33,220	19.5%	6.3%	8.6%
Albany	4,230	4,930	5,220	5,630	16.5%	5.9%	7.9%
Berkeley	77,110	87,530	92,340	99,330	13.5%	5.5%	7.6%
Dublin	16,810	24,100	27,270	31,650	43.4%	13.2%	16.1%
Emeryville	16,070	20,080	21,520	23,610	25.0%	7.2%	9.7%
Fremont	90,010	106,540	111,820	120,000	18.4%	5.0%	7.3%
Hayward	68,140	78,910	82,360	87,820	15.8%	4.4%	6.6%
Livermore	38,450	46,550	49,240	53,210	21.1%	5.8%	8.1%
Newark	17,930	20,840	21,720	23,150	16.2%	4.2%	6.6%
Oakland	190,490	233,630	250,800	275,760	22.6%	7.3%	10.0%
Piedmont	1,930	2,150	2,260	2,410	11.4%	5.1%	6.6%
Pleasanton	54,340	63,050	65,620	69,640	16.0%	4.1%	6.1%
San Leandro	39,980	47,150	49,410	52,920	17.9%	4.8%	7.1%
Union City	20,600	23,500	24,310	25,700	14.1%	3.4%	5.7%
Unincorporated	34,300	39,060	40,910	43,600	13.9%	4.7%	6.6%

Source: ABAG Projections 2013

Unemployment

According to 2011 ACS 5-year Estimates, 68,391 Unincorporated County residents over the age of 16 were in the labor force. Of these residents, 64,947 were employed, yielding an unemployment rate of 5.0 percent. Unemployment, as reported by the State Employment Development Department in November 2013, ranged from a high of 9.9 percent in Cherryland to a low of 4.0 percent in Castro Valley. Please see the table below for more information.

Table II-34: Unemployment Rates, Alameda County

Place	Labor Force	Employment	Unemployment	
			Number	Rate
Alameda County	771,900	719,700	52,200	6.8%
Alameda	40,800	38,900	1,900	4.6%
Albany	9,300	9,100	300	2.8%
Ashland CDP	10,400	9,600	800	7.9%
Berkeley	59,700	55,900	3,800	6.4%
Castro Valley CDP	31,600	30,400	1,200	3.8%
Cherryland CDP	6,700	6,000	700	9.9%
Dublin	15,800	15,100	600	4.1%
Emeryville	4,600	4,400	200	4.8%
Fairview CDP	5,400	5,200	200	4.1%
Fremont	112,100	106,700	5,400	4.8%
Hayward	71,100	65,800	5,400	7.6%
Livermore	42,100	40,300	1,800	4.4%
Newark	22,800	21,400	1,400	6.3%
Oakland	202,300	181,300	21,000	10.4%
Piedmont	5,600	5,400	200	3.5%
Pleasanton	36,300	35,100	1,200	3.4%
San Leandro	42,300	39,500	2,800	6.7%
San Lorenzo CDP	10,900	10,300	500	5.0%
Sunol CDP	800	700	100	7.1%
Union City	34,900	32,700	2,200	6.3%

Source: California Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, December 2013

HOUSING PROBLEMS

The Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) developed by the Census for HUD provides detailed information on housing needs by income level for different types of households in Unincorporated Alameda County. Housing problems considered by CHAS include:

- Housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 30 percent of gross income;
- Severe housing cost burden, including utilities, exceeding 50 percent of gross income;
- Overcrowded conditions (housing units with more than one person per room); and
- Units with physical defects (lacking complete kitchen or bathroom).

The types of problems vary according to household income, type, and tenure. Some highlights include:

- In general, owner-households were more likely to pay more than 30% of their gross monthly income for housing.

- Residents of Ashland were more likely to spend more than 30% of their gross household income for housing.
- Ashland and Cherryland residents were more likely to live in overcrowded conditions (more than one person per room)

A summary of housing units experiencing problems is provided below.

Table II-35: Housing Units with 1 or More Problems, 2007-2011

		Income Level					TOTAL
		Extremely Low <30% of AMI	Very Low 30 to 50% of AMI	Low 50 to 80% of AMI	Moderate 80 to 100% of AMI	Above Moderate 100%+ of AMI	
Owner	Number	1,140	1,010	2,185	1,724	4,640	10,699
	Percent	62.0%	48.1%	61.1%	56.2%	26.6%	38.2%
Renter	Number	3,084	2,489	2,284	764	425	9,046
	Percent	84.8%	82.6%	67.5%	37.3%	9.4%	54.4%
Total	Number	4,224	3,499	4,469	2,488	5,065	19,745
	Percent	77.2%	68.4%	64.2%	48.6%	23.1%	44.2%
Occupied Units	Owner	1,840	2,100	3,575	3,070	17,430	28,015
	Renter	3,635	3,015	3,384	2,050	4,540	16,624
	Total	5,475	5,115	6,959	5,120	21,970	44,639

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

In 1990 36.7 percent of all households experienced problems (i.e. overcrowding; overpayment; or lack of complete kitchen facilities, adequate plumbing or phone service) that number has increased to 44.2 percent of all households in Unincorporated Alameda County.

Cost Burden/Overpayment Above 30% of Income

Cost burden – also known as overpayment for housing – is a significant problem for many Alameda County residents, especially as the housing values shot up in the past few years. As housing becomes increasingly scarce, people are required to spend more and more of their income for housing. Data in Table II-36 shows that within Unincorporated Alameda County 41.4 percent of all households reported that they paid 30 percent or more of their gross monthly income on housing. Owner occupied units had a larger share of households overpaying for housing (23.3% vs. 18.1%). When disaggregated by income level, units occupied by renters having low incomes reported the highest percentage of persons overpaying for housing. However, moderate and above moderate income owner occupied units also have high levels of overpayment. Renters with moderate and above moderate incomes accounted for nearly 38 percent of all renters (6,710 households). Of those households, 11 percent (726 households) paid more than 30 percent of their income for housing. Moderate and above moderate income households comprised more than 66 percent (6,610) of the total of households in owner-occupied units that are overpaying for their housing costs. This data suggests that even persons who are able to afford market rate housing must devote more of their income to housing costs. This data is consistent with data from other sources documenting the high cost of living in the San Francisco Bay Area and indicates a demand for owner-occupied and rental housing.

Table II-36: Overpayment by Income Level, 2008-12

Total Households Characteristics	Number	Percent
<i>Total occupied units (households)</i>	47,650	--
Total Renter households	17,795	37.3%
Total Owner households	29,855	62.7%
<i>Total lower income (0-80% of HAMFI) households</i>	18,925	39.7%
Lower income renters (0-80%)	11,085	23.3%
Lower income owners (0-80%)	7,840	16.5%
Extremely low income renters (0-30%)	3,825	8.0%
Extremely low income owners (0-30%)	1,865	3.9%
<i>Lower income households paying more than 50%</i>	7,166	15.0%
Lower income renter HH severely overpaying	4,091	8.6%
Lower income owner HH severely overpaying	3,075	6.5%
Extremely Low Income (0-30%)	3,810	8.0%
ELI Renter HH severely overpaying	2,915	6.1%
ELI Owner HH severely overpaying	895	1.9%
Income between 30%-50%	1,905	4.0%
Income between 50% -80%	1,451	3.0%
<i>Lower income households paying more than 30%</i>	12,371	26.0%
Lower income renter HH overpaying	7,901	16.6%
Lower income owner HH overpaying	4,470	9.4%
Extremely Low Income (0-30%)	4,390	9.2%
Income between 30%-50%	3,690	7.7%
Income between 50% -80%	4,291	9.0%
<i>Total Households Overpaying</i>	19,707	41.4%
Total Renter Households Overpaying	8,627	18.1%
Total Owner Households Overpaying	11,080	23.3%

Source: State HCD

Overcrowding

The definition of overcrowding depends upon the type of housing assistance program and source of funding involved. For the purposes of this discussion, the federal Census definition of more than one person per room will be used. In Unincorporated Alameda County, approximately 5.2 percent of all households were overcrowded in 2010 (Table II-37). Renter occupied units were more likely than owner occupied to be overcrowded (3.6% vs. 1.6%). When analyzed by community (Table II-38), differences exist between neighborhoods, with Ashland (11.9%) and Cherryland (12.6%) having the largest percentages of overcrowded households and Sunol having the lowest (1.7%).

Table II-37: Housing Units that are Overcrowded by Tenure, 2006-2010

Tenure	Overcrowded (≥ 1 person per room)	Severely Overcrowded (≥ 1.5 persons per room)	% Overcrowded (≥ 1 person per room)	% Severely Overcrowded (≥ 1.5 persons per room)
Owner Occupied	534	194	1.2%	0.4%
Renter Occupied	935	680	2.1%	1.5%
Total Occupied Units, Unincorporated Alameda County				44,765

Source: ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Alameda County can help alleviate overcrowding by supporting the development of affordable housing. The County's efforts in support of affordable housing are described in the County's *Housing Plan*, Chapter 4.

Table II-38: Housing Units that are Overcrowded by Place, 2008-2012

Place	Occupied Housing Units		Occupants Per Room		
			1.00 or less	1.01 to 1.50	1.51 or more
Ashland CDP	Number	7,187	6,334	629	224
	Percent	100.0%	88.1%	8.8%	3.1%
Castro Valley CDP	Number	21,923	21,321	530	72
	Percent	100.0%	97.3%	2.4%	0.3%
Cherryland CDP	Number	4,362	3,813	384	165
	Percent	100.0%	87.4%	8.8%	3.8%
Fairview CDP	Number	3,492	3,400	56	36
	Percent	100.0%	97.4%	1.6%	1.0%
San Lorenzo CDP	Number	7,446	6,959	392	95
	Percent	100.0%	93.5%	5.3%	1.3%
Sunol CDP	Number	348	342	6	0
	Percent	100.0%	98.3%	1.7%	0.0%

Source: American Community Survey 5 year Estimates (2008-2012), Table B25014

Physical Defects

Physical defects may include poor sanitary conditions caused by either a lack of complete plumbing or kitchen facilities, or the lack of telephone service. Tables I-39 and I-40 provide information on physical defects of housing in Unincorporated Alameda County. In 2011, nearly 2 percent of all occupied housing units had one or more housing problems in Unincorporated Alameda County. Overall, lack of telephone service was the most widely reported problem. Table II-40 separates this data by CDP. In 2011, Castro Valley residents reported the largest number of occupied units with problems. Overall persons residing in the unincorporated remainder have the highest percentages of persons reporting housing problems. It should be noted that some of the persons reporting that their unit lacks either adequate plumbing, kitchen facilities or telephone service may be housed in group quarters (such as nursing homes or other group living situations) that do not provide private kitchen or restrooms in the individual unit. As there is no data collected indicating whether or not the lack of services is evidence of a code violation or by design, staff cannot be sure to what extent the numbers reflect an actual violations of law.

Deficiencies also found to cause health issues include open cracks or holes in walls, broken plaster/peeling paint, water leaks from inside and outside, roofing, siding and window problems. Such issues are chronicled in the 2011 American Housing Survey, but unfortunately that data is not collected separately for unincorporated Alameda County, but instead is collected for the Oakland-Fremont-Hayward PMSA.

The presence of asbestos or lead-based paint can also be an indicator of housing condition. The Alameda County Planning Department estimates nearly two thirds of the housing units in unincorporated Alameda County may contain lead-based paint. The large percentage of homes constructed before the 1960s increases the probability of lead-based paint and lead hazards in these homes since this type of paint was commonly used up to that time. Lead paint was not banned from residential use until 1978. Despite the ban, lead-based paint becomes more

hazardous as the older layers break down and become deteriorated over time, including normal wear and tear on friction surfaces. Unsafe painting and renovations on these homes can also create lead dust hazards; and specialized training and lead safe work practices are now required under Federal and State law for most work disturbing lead-based paint. According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and California’s Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Branch, lead paint is the primary cause of lead exposure for children who live in older homes.

Asthma is also a concern in unincorporated Alameda County. Asthma causes school and work absences, raises health care costs for treatment and emergency room visits, limits an individual’s activities, and impacts their quality of life. According to the Federal Healthy Homes Work Group publication *Advancing Healthy Housing: a Strategy for Action*, an estimated 39% of children under six with asthma nationwide are impacted by exposure to indoor air hazards in their homes. Indoor air hazards include mold and moisture, pest infestations, and poor ventilation.

Alameda County can help ensure that the local housing stock is maintained and improved in a safe and healthy manner by providing financial and technical assistance to properties occupied by low income families and by carrying out appropriate code enforcement programs. The Alameda County Neighborhood Preservation and Sustainability Department (NPS) programs addressed substandard housing conditions including lead-based paint and other health and safety issues as well as providing accessibility improvements, primarily for low-income homeowners. Since 2007, NPS has completed 185 Minor Home Repair projects in unincorporated Alameda County and 75 Single Family Rehabilitations (both accessibility grants and repair loans). This program has moved to the Alameda County Community Development Agency’s Healthy Homes Department (HHD), which provides technical assistance to property owners, tenant education, lead-safety skills training, In-Home Consultants for property owner in the cities of Oakland, Berkeley, Emeryville and Alameda and provides Healthy Housing interventions in Alameda County. The HH Department will begin combining the CDBG and Cal HOME funded Housing Preservation Program with its own Lead Hazard Remediation Program in the Unincorporated County beginning in FY 14/15. In addition, the County has persons working in Fire, Building and Planning who are trained to evaluate violations of their respective codes. In addition to identifying hazards for occupants and owners of the housing units, these programs can also support the community by reducing neighborhood blight and preserving property values.

Table II-39: Households with Housing Problems in Unincorporated Alameda County by Type of Problem, 2007-2011 Estimates

Type of Problem	Housing Units		Occupied Units	
	Number	Percent of Total Housing Units	Number	Percent of Occupied Housing Units
Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities	404	0.8%	166	0.3%
Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities	740	1.5%	213	0.4%
No telephone service available	----	----	560	1.2%
TOTAL	50,136	100.0%	47,765	100.0%

Source: ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Table II-40: Condition of Occupied Housing Units, Unincorporated Alameda County CDPs, 2007-2011 Estimates

Place	Occupied Housing Units		Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities	Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities	No Telephone Service Available
	Number	Percent			
Ashland CDP	Number	7,099	0	55	66
	Percent	----	0.0%	0.8%	0.9%
Castro Valley CDP	Number	22,066	74	108	244
	Percent	----	0.3%	0.5%	1.1%
Cherryland CDP	Number	4,369	8	0	113
	Percent	----	0.2%	0.0%	2.6%
Fairview CDP	Number	3,304	0	0	19
	Percent	----	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
San Lorenzo CDP	Number	7,473	33	0	34
	Percent	----	0.4%	0.0%	0.5%
Sunol CDP	Number	313	2	0	6
	Percent	----	0.6%	0.0%	1.9%
Remainder	Number	2,821	49	50	78
	Percent	----	1.7%	1.7%	2.8%
TOTAL	Number	44,765	166	213	560
	Percent	----	0.3%	0.4%	1.2%

Source: Planning Department, American Community Survey 5 year Estimates (2007-2011), Table DP04

SPECIAL NEEDS HOUSING

Special Needs Households are defined as those with disabled members, large households, female-headed households, farm or agricultural workers, the homeless or the elderly.

Large Households

A large household is defined as one with more than five members. Given today's housing market, large households may represent various compositions, including nuclear families (parents and children), extended families (those that include grandparents or other family members), and subfamilies (where married couples with or without children or single-parents living together). These characteristics reflect such circumstances as changes in lifestyle, lack of affordable housing, or the desire for family support.

Large households are considered a special needs group because of the general lack of adequately sized, affordable housing. On a per capita basis, large households also tend to have lower disposable income for housing compared to other household types. Large households require adequately sized housing at affordable costs. A location within proximity to public transportation, services, and community facilities is also important. The lack of these housing characteristics most often results in overcrowding.

According to data from the 2010 Census, a 5 person household is the most prevalent large household size. In addition, there are 5,701 households with five or more persons in Unincorporated Alameda County, roughly the same number of large households as there were

in 2000. Table II-41 summarizes this data.

Table II-41: Large Households, 2010

Household Size		Owner	Renter
5-person	Number	2,266	1,722
	Percent	7.7%	9.1%
6-person	Number	946	767
	Percent	3.2%	4.0%
7-or-more person	Number	832	643
	Percent	2.8%	3.4%
5-or-more person	Number	3,988	1,713
	Percent	13.5%	9.0%
Total Households		29,519	18,997

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

There is an acute shortage of rental housing units with four or more bedrooms. The 2000 Census identified 2,209 renter households with five or more persons, but only 546 rental units with four or more bedrooms (data for number of bedrooms in housing units not available in 2010 Census data) available. There is a much better relationship between the number of large homeowner families and large owner-occupied units. In 2000, there were 3,760 owner households residing in 7,311 units. Overcrowding rates are still very high for lower income large families, which suggests that more affluent families are able to occupy homes larger than they might need, while low and moderate income large families can achieve homeownership only by buying units smaller than what they might need.

The County assists large households primarily through provision of Section 8 Housing Vouchers and rehabilitation assistance. These programs are described in Chapter 4. In addition, the County promotes the development of second units on existing single-family lots, allowing households to expand on their properties. County HCD and ECD provides financing for the development of new affordable housing construction. Developers are encouraged to incorporate units with three or more bedrooms to accommodate larger families. Larger bedroom counts also assist developers in obtaining leverage financing from State funding sources.

Single Parent Families

Single parent families require special consideration and assistance because they tend to have lower incomes and a greater need for affordable day care, health care, and other related services. More recent, reliable data is not available, but according to the 2000 Census more than half of the families in poverty were female headed. Table II-42 shows that in 2010, there were 7,195 female headed families, representing 14.8 percent of all households. Female headed families with children under the age of 18 comprised 8.9 of all households, and 60 percent of all female headed families. Female headed families with no children under the age of 18 represents 5.9 percent of all families, and 40 percent of all female headed families in the Unincorporated Alameda County. There are fewer male households with no wife present, with or without children. Readers should note that same-sex couples in registered domestic partnerships were not considered a “family” by the U.S. Census Bureau until 2014.

Table II-42: Single Parent Families, 2010

Households	Alameda County		Unincorporated Alameda County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Family Households	352,423	64.6%	34,944	72.0%
Male Householder, No Wife Present	28,573	5.2%	3,077	6.3%
-With No Children Under 18 Years	13,760	2.5%	1,429	2.9%
-With Children Under 18 Years	14,813	2.7%	1,648	3.4%
Female Householder, No Husband Present	70,165	12.9%	7,195	14.8%
-With No Children Under 18 Years	28,225	5.2%	2,882	5.9%
-With Children Under 18 Years	41,940	7.7%	4,313	8.9%
All Households	545,138	----	48,516	----

Source: Planning Department, 2010 Decennial Census, Table PCT21

Persons with Disabilities

There are a wide variety of disabilities experienced by County residents, including mobility limitations or more acute physical disability, mental disability, substance abuse problems and/or HIV/AIDS. Each of these types of disabilities brings with it a myriad of needs, from specialized services to variations in accessibility needs.

Social Security Income (SSI) is one of the main sources of income for disabled households. Without affordable housing, people with disabilities must often live at home with aging parents, in homeless shelters, in institutions or nursing homes, or be forced into substandard housing.

According to the 2008-2012 American Community Survey, 13,358 persons with difficulties were living in non-institutional settings in the Unincorporated County. Of The community with the highest percentage of persons with difficulties was Fairview (13%), followed by Cherryland and San Lorenzo, each with 12%.

Many people with difficulties have high medical and/or equipment costs which, when combined with high housing costs, can take up most of the household's incomes. Persons with mobility difficulties require accessible housing – both to live in and to be able to visit friends and neighbors and participate in the community. Access to transit is also particularly important to many people with difficulties as they may be unable to drive or families may not be able to afford accessible vehicles. Table II-44 summarizes the number of persons by their type of disability, and age group for all unincorporated CDPs. This data includes persons living in institutional and non-institutional settings.

Table II-43: Persons with Difficulty by Difficulty Type and Age, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2008-2012

Unincorporated Alameda County	Number	Percent
Total Persons with Difficulties	13,358	100.0%
<i>Total With Difficulties Under Age 5</i>	<i>41</i>	<i>0.3%</i>
Hearing	0	0.0%
Vision	41	0.3%
<i>Total With Difficulties Ages 5-17</i>	<i>1,364</i>	<i>10.2%</i>
Hearing	52	0.2%
Vision	110	0.8%
Cognitive	597	4.5%
Ambulatory	90	0.7%
Self-Care	158	1.2%
<i>Total Persons Ages 18-64</i>	<i>6,682</i>	<i>50.0%</i>
Hearing	1,484	11.1%
Vision	1,033	7.7%
Cognitive	2,585	19.4%
Ambulatory	3,490	26.1%
Self-Care	1,485	11.1%
Independent Living	2,358	17.7%
<i>Total Persons Ages 65 and Over</i>	<i>5,890</i>	<i>44.1%</i>
Hearing	2,001	15.0%
Vision	1,288	9.6%
Cognitive	1,530	11.5%
Ambulatory	3,839	28.7%
Self-Care	1,679	12.6%
Independent Living	3,175	23.8%

Source: Alameda County HCD, American Community Survey 2012 Five-year Estimates, Table S180

Table II-44: Persons with Difficulty by Difficulty Type and Age, by Unincorporated Place, 2008-2012

	Ashland		Castro Valley		Cherryland		Fairview		San Lorenzo		Sunol	
	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
Total Persons with Difficulties	2,096	9%	5,316	9%	1,709	12%	1,309	13%	2,861	12%	67	8%
<i>Under Age 5</i>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	11	3%	30	3%	0	0%
Hearing	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Vision	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	11	3%	30	3%	0	0%
<i>Ages 5-17</i>	105	2%	229	2%	101	4%	65	5%	242	6%	3	3%
Hearing	17	0%	13	0%	0	0%	0	0%	22	1%	0	0%
Vision	0	0%	51	1%	8	0%	12	1%	39	1%	0	0%
Cognitive	88	2%	175	2%	93	4%	55	4%	183	4%	3	3%
Ambulatory	0	0%	17	0%	7	0%	22	2%	44	1%	0	0%
Self-Care	27	1%	27	0%	7	0%	12	1%	85	2%	0	0%
<i>Ages 18-64</i>	1,239	9%	2,285	6%	1,212	13%	742	11%	1,160	8%	44	8%
Hearing	344	2%	633	2%	105	1%	121	2%	260	2%	21	4%
Vision	233	2%	401	1%	71	1%	202	3%	117	1%	9	2%
Cognitive	478	3%	853	2%	531	6%	254	4%	458	3%	11	2%
Ambulatory	727	5%	938	2%	786	9%	426	6%	610	4%	3	1%
Self-Care	308	2%	433	1%	290	3%	207	3%	247	2%	0	0%
Independent Living	419	3%	772	2%	378	4%	304	5%	485	3%	0	0%
<i>Ages 65+</i>	752	44%	2,802	36%	396	44%	491	32%	1,429	44%	20	16%
Hearing	355	21%	880	11%	106	12%	198	13%	462	14%	0	0%
Vision	196	11%	597	8%	52	6%	140	9%	295	9%	8	7%
Cognitive	320	19%	751	10%	79	9%	104	7%	276	9%	0	0%
Ambulatory	419	24%	1,789	23%	303	34%	323	21%	1,002	31%	12	10%
Self-Care	113	7%	961	12%	107	12%	135	9%	351	11%	12	10%
Independent Living	374	22%	1,637	21%	185	21%	252	16%	725	23%	2	2%

Source: Alameda County HCD, American Community Survey 2012 Five-year Estimates, Table S1801

Affordability, design, location, and fair housing non-compliance may limit the supply of housing for persons with difficulties. Housing needs also differ depending on the type of disability. Persons who are mentally ill are usually in need of emergency shelters and transitional housing. Elderly persons with self-care and mobility limitations may desire shared living arrangements. The most critical housing need for persons with difficulties is housing that is adapted to their limitations. Many single-family homes may not be adaptable to widened doorways and hallways, access ramps, or other features necessary for accessibility. Furthermore multi-family units built prior to 1990 are often not wheel-chair accessible and the cost of retrofitting a home is often prohibitive.

The County offers a variety of housing and supportive services for persons with difficulties via the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG), HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME), Housing Opportunities for Persons with Aids (HOPWA) programs, as well as the Continuum of Care system (EveryOne Home) coordinated by the County. County housing programs and regulations facilitate the provision of special needs housing such as emergency shelters and transitional/supportive housing, assisted living and group homes. The Housing Element also includes a number of programs that are targeted for persons with difficulties as described in Chapter 1.

Developmental Disabilities

According to Section 4512 of the Welfare and Institutions Code a "Developmental disability" means a disability that originates before an individual attains age 18 years, continues, or can be expected to continue, indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual which includes mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism. This term shall also include disabling conditions found to be closely related to mental retardation or to require treatment similar to that required for individuals with mental retardation, but shall not include other handicapping conditions that are solely physical in nature.

Many developmentally disabled persons can live and work independently within a conventional housing environment. More severely disabled individuals require a group living environment where supervision is provided. The most severely affected individuals may require an institutional environment where medical attention and physical therapy are provided. Because developmental disabilities exist before adulthood, 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.

Senate Bill 812 requires that the Housing Element discuss the housing needs of persons with developmental disabilities. A developmental disability is defined as a disability that originates before an individual attains age 18 years, continues, or can be expected to continue, indefinitely, and constitutes a substantial disability for that individual. This includes mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and autism.

The Census does not record developmental disabilities. According to the California State Council on Developmental Disabilities, an accepted estimate of the percentage of the population that can be defined as developmentally disabled is 1.8 percent. Using this figure, approximately 2,543 persons in the unincorporated area of Alameda County are estimated to have a developmental disability based on the 2010 Census population.

The State Department of Developmental Services (DDS) currently provides community-based services to approximately 243,000 persons with developmental disabilities and their families through a statewide system of 21 regional centers, four developmental centers, and two

community-based facilities. The Regional Center of the East Bay (RCEB) is one of the 21 regional centers in the State of California that provides point of entry to services for people with developmental disabilities. The RCEB is a private, non-profit community agency that contracts with local businesses to offer a wide range of services to individuals with developmental disabilities and their families. As of June, 2013, RCEB, and its affiliated providers, served approximately 8,712 residents in Alameda County.⁷

In anticipation of the Housing Element Update, RCEB has prepared an estimate of the number of persons with developmental disabilities in Alameda County. This data is based on the number of persons accessing services from RCEB affiliated and non-affiliated groups. Data is provided for the following CDPs: Ashland, Castro Valley, Cherryland and Sunol. They estimate that there are 566 persons accessing services in these communities, and that over the implementation period they will require 202 units of housing to accommodate their needs. There are a number of housing types appropriate for people living with a developmental disability such as: rent subsidized homes, licensed and unlicensed single-family homes, and Section 8 vouchers. 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.

Elderly and Seniors

The housing needs of the elderly require special consideration. Elderly persons may not be able to care for themselves, others may not desire to live alone, or others may not be able to maintain their homes and prefer to move into smaller homes or rental housing. The problem for some elderly lower income people is that they may spend a large portion of their fixed income on housing, which leaves little money to pay for other life necessities, such as medical care and prescriptions, food, or transportation. For the disabled elderly population, the challenge of finding permanent housing with supportive services can be even greater. The death of a spouse or partner compounds the problem because the survivor often has reduced income without a reduction in housing cost. Many are faced with the choice of moving with limited housing choices or losing the ability to live independently. Subsidized housing units for low-income elderly people within the County have significant waiting lists, which puts this population at risk of becoming homeless if they are unable to obtain affordable housing.

According to the American Community Survey (2007-2011) 5 year Estimates, there are 16,255 persons over the age of 65 living in Unincorporated Alameda County and 9,786 households headed by persons over 65. The ACS also estimates that during that same period, 42 percent of seniors lived alone. Table II-44 shows the number of elderly households by tenure. In 2000, 82 percent of seniors owned their homes and 18 percent were renters. While in 2010, 79 percent of senior households live in homes that they own, and 21 percent are renters. The data in Tables I-45 and I-46 shows that while seniors typically have lower incomes, the number of seniors that own homes their own exceeded the average rate of homeownership in Unincorporated Alameda County in both 2000 and 2010. Though the rate of ownership is higher than average, the number of seniors in rental housing has increased 185 persons, a nearly ten percent increase over the 2000 figure.

This trend suggests a continued and increasing need for affordable senior housing, especially rental housing for very low-income seniors, and a growing need for assisted care facilities so that seniors do not have to leave their community as they age. Even those seniors who do not

⁷ ABAG Data Warehouse, 2013

need financial assistance may face limited choices for suitable housing if they choose to stay in Unincorporated Alameda County.

Table II-45: Senior Householders by Tenure and Age, Total of Unincorporated CDPs, 2000 and 2010

Age	Owners		Renters		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
2000					
65-74 years	3,902	82%	860	18%	4,762
75 plus years	4,412	81%	1,018	19%	5,430
All ages	30,722	63%	17,807	37%	48,529
TOTAL	8,314	82%	1,878	18%	10,192
2010					
65-74 years	3,641	78%	1,022	22%	4,663
75 plus years	4,055	80%	1,041	20%	5,096
All ages	29,519	61%	18,997	39%	48,516
TOTAL	7,696	79%	2,063	21%	9,759

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Table II-46: Senior Household Income, Total of Unincorporated CDPs, 2007-2011 Estimates

Income	Number	Percent
Under \$30,000	3,156	32%
\$30,000 to \$49,999	2,090	21%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	1,682	17%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	966	10%
More than \$100,000	1,892	19%
TOTAL	9,786	100%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Table II-46 analyzes the number of seniors living in poverty as compared to the Unincorporated County as a whole. Overall, seniors are less likely to live in poverty, than the population as a whole. This was not only the case in 2000, but also in 2011.

Table II-47: Poverty Rate by Age, Unincorporated Alameda County 2000 and 2007-2011 Estimates

Year	Poverty Rate for Total Population	Below Poverty			
		65 to 74		75+	
2000	7.4%	397	5.0%	547	6.5%
2011	10.2%	668	8.5%	787	9.1%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

To encourage an increase in the supply of affordable housing for low-income seniors, the County offers an additional density bonus for projects that only rent to senior households of moderate income or less. The County Community Development Agency administers an array of housing programs to assist low income senior to stay in their home, including home repair and accessibility upgrades. The Alameda County Community Development Agency funds affordable housing rental projects, including those set aside for Senior Households. The

Planning Department also provides development incentives such as density bonuses and expedited permit processing for affordable housing developments, which includes senior housing projects. The County's policy promotes the development of secondary units which may be used to house an elderly person or their caregiver.

Homeless Persons and Families

Homelessness typically occurs because housing is not affordable or there is insufficient income to weather a personal crisis such as loss of employment or a family illness and continue to pay for housing. Mental disabilities, domestic violence, and alcohol or drug addiction and other problems are contributing factors. Lack of affordable housing, inadequate incomes, and insufficient access to social services are the core causes of homelessness. Homeless people live in cars, parks, abandoned buildings, on the streets, in emergency shelters, doubled up with friends and family members, and in transitional and supportive housing.

The State of California requires each local government to submit a Housing Element as part of its General Plan every eight years. Beginning in 2007, the State required local governments to provide information on Homeless individuals and families in their Housing Elements. Alameda County HCD is the lead agency collecting and analyzing data on Homelessness in Alameda County. There are two different methods that Homeless information is collected and recorded. The first is a bi-annual statistical count conducted in January every other year as a requirement of HUD funding. The second is the collection of information on homeless individuals and families into a database by all agencies which receive federal homeless funding.

County-wide Homeless Count

Beginning in 2003, Alameda County HCD has conducted a point-in-time biennial Homeless Count per HUD mandate. The Count has been held annually for sheltered populations and bi-annually for unsheltered populations. Homeless Count Data and analysis is available at http://www.everyonehome.org/resources_homeless_count.html for the 2009, 2011, and 2013 counts.

The 2013 Homeless Count analysis included a 10-year review and comparison (between 2003's Count). These Counts rely on a statistical sampling methodology (approved by HUD) that is effective in enumerating homeless populations. This data is collected county-wide. The 2013 Homeless Count reflects a total of 4,264 individuals identified as homeless on the night of January 30, 2013.

HMIS

Since 2003, Alameda County has implemented a County-wide Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) as a requirement for receipt of HUD funding. To date, more than 40,000 unduplicated clients have been entered from 35 services agencies in Alameda County. This database collects more demographic data than the Homeless Count. A report was generated in HMIS to coincide with the Homeless Count. This report was filtered to reflect a count of those who were categorized as "Literally Homeless" at program entry. The HMIS Report reflects a total of 5,844 individuals who were homeless on January 30, 2013

The methodology used to conduct the Homeless Count is a more reliable way to accurately assess the homeless population, including sheltered and unsheltered homeless, than the HMIS Report. Therefore, when choosing between the two methods, County HCD uses the Homeless Count number to report to HUD and for use in setting local housing policy. Unfortunately, the Homeless Count provides county-wide statistics and demographics that cannot be broken down

to city level data. It would be cost prohibitive to collect enough data to gain information specific enough to each city in the County.

Assignment of 2013 Homeless Population

Since the Homeless Count does not provide enough information to assign the 4,264 homeless between cities, we use the HMIS data for demographic information at the city level. The January 30, 2013 point-in-time HMIS Report includes information on last permanent address, which allows HCD to arrive at percentages of homeless population by city. Once the percentages are known, the total 2013 Homeless Count population can be spread across the cities in the County, assigning a homeless number to each jurisdiction.

Methodology: First, using the January 30, 2013 HMIS data, the 5,844 were filtered by the field “last known address” providing a breakdown by city, with a certain number coming up unknown/other. In the unincorporated county, Castro Valley, San Lorenzo and Sunol are listed separately. However Ashland numbers are included in the City of San Leandro data, and Fairview and Cherryland numbers are included in the City of Hayward'.

Second, those responses that were “Unknown/Other” were removed from the total so that each city’s percentage added to all others equaled 100% of the total responses. Last, each city’s percentage was applied to the 2013 Homeless Count of 4,264, arriving at an assignment for each city to use in their housing element.

Demographic Information: While the Homeless Count total population is more accurate than the total population generated by the HMIS Report, it does not provide us with demographic information needed for local governments to understand the needs of the homeless in their jurisdiction. HMIS collects a large amount of demographic data on homeless populations, including race and ethnicity information, age and gender, disability status and employment status. The types of community support systems and agency partners which provide this detail in HMIS include:

- Drop-In Centers
- Employment Training
- Emergency Shelter
- Rapid Re-housing
- Transitional Housing

While the HMIS data is the most current and complete data available, it has some limitations, including:

1. HMIS only contains information from homeless agencies which enter data into the system, and only agencies which receive HUD funding are mandated to do so. Over the last few years, additional non HUD funded agencies have voluntarily chosen to participate in the HMIS system.
2. For confidentiality reasons, homeless providers which specifically provide services to victims of Domestic Violence are not required to participate in HMIS since the passage of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA, enacted 1994).
3. Children under the age of 18 (who account for a large number of the homeless population county-wide), are not tracked as thoroughly as adults and the information for children is less detailed. Following March 2010, there was an expansion in data collection for those under age 18 and included collection of zip code of last permanent housing. This resulted in some updates and data collection of this population.

This means that for various reasons, not all homeless individuals are in the system or have sought or received services by an HMIS-entering agency.

The HMIS demographic data is provided below. The total number represented is the number from the January 30, 2013 HMIS Report; however, this does not match the Homeless Count Assignment for each city or place. For the purposes of this Housing Element, County staff considers the Homeless Count assignment as its total homeless population.

Housing Element Homeless Information

For the Unincorporated County, only Castro Valley and San Lorenzo are specifically identified places (with mailing addresses equivalent to cities). Ashland, Cherryland, Fairview, and Hillcrest Knolls neighborhoods of the unincorporated County are not places that are identified as “places of last permanent address”. For those homeless individuals and families whose last permanent address was in Ashland or Hillcrest Knolls, they would have listed San Leandro as their last permanent address. For those living in Cherryland or Fairview, they would have listed Hayward as their last permanent address. The unincorporated area of Cherryland and Fairview are identified by residents as Hayward, therefore a portion of Hayward’s population was assigned to this unincorporated area.

Given those caveats, the Ashland percentage of homeless persons is 0.67 percent, Castro Valley percentage 0.92 percent, Cherryland/Fairview is 1.16 percent, San Lorenzo is 0.41 percent and Sunol is 0.03 percent. As a result, 4.07 percent of the County’s total homeless population resides in Unincorporated Alameda County. The total number of homeless adults allocated to the Unincorporated County in 2013 is 173.

Applying those percentages to the actual number count and data provides us with a snap shot of who the homeless are. For instance, of the total adult homeless population, only 11 percent of the homeless are over the age of 61 years of age, approximately 46 percent are male and 53 percent are female, and nearly 17 percent of the homeless population reported being employed, and nearly 47 percent reported having a disability of some kind.

Table II-48: Homeless Information, 2013

Unincorporated Alameda County	Percentage
<i>Age</i>	
Under 18	5.5%
Adults (18 - 60)	83.5%
Senior (61+)	11.0%
Total Number of Adults	100.0%
<i>Gender</i>	
Male	45.9%
Female	53.2%
Transgender	0.9%
Total	100.0%
<i>Ethnicity</i>	
Hispanic/Latino	23.9%
Non Hispanic/Latino	76.1%
Total	100.0%
<i>Race</i>	
American Indian or Alaskan Native	2.8%
Asian	0.9%
Black or African American	25.7%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1.8%
White	56.9%
Other (all other combinations)	11.9%
Total	100.0%
<i>Employment Status (adults only)</i>	
Employed	16.5%
Un-employed	77.7%
Unknown	5.8%
Total	100.0%
<i>Disability (adults only)</i>	
Yes	63.1%
No	36.9%
Don't Know	0.0%
Refused/Unknown	0.0%
Total	100.0%
<i>Type of Disability * (adults with a disability only)</i>	
Alcohol Abuse	24.6%
Alcohol & Drug	12.3%
Chronic Health	32.3%
Developmental	9.2%
Drug Abuse	23.1%
HIV/AIDS	1.5%
Mental Health	66.2%
Total persons with disability	100.0%

Source: Planning Department, Alameda County HCD

Note:

*- A person may have multiple disabilities.

Senate Bill 2 (SB2) of 2007 requires local jurisdictions to strengthen provisions for addressing the housing needs of the homeless including the identification of a zone or zones where emergency shelters, transitional housing, and supportive housing are allowed as permitted uses without a conditional use permit. An emergency shelter is defined as “housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that is limited to occupancy of six months or less by a homeless person. No individual or household may be denied emergency shelter because of an inability to pay.” If adequate existing facilities are not available, the law requires jurisdictions to identify areas where new facilities are permitted “by right” (i.e., without requiring a public hearing which is mandatory for some discretionary approvals such as a use permit). The County Zoning Ordinance allows emergency shelters by-right in the R-4 District, and transitional/supportive housing is permitted as a residential use subject to the same standards as apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zoning district.

Homelessness is a regional issue. The County supports efforts to end homelessness through County HCD and the Continuum of Care, which in Alameda County is called EveryOne Home. The County provides funding support to a myriad of homeless services providers countywide. Although most facilities are not located in the Unincorporated County, they are located where there is convenient access to sites via transit, or in proximity to other service providers. Alameda County currently provides funding for emergency, transitional and permanent supportive housing. The County also provides funding for supportive services such as food banks, legal services and information and referral. An inventory of service providers that serve individuals in the mid-county region is included as Appendix J.

Agricultural Workers

Determining the exact number of agricultural workers – and their housing needs – is made all the more difficult by the seasonal nature of much of the work. Various studies have shown that agricultural workers in California tend to have lower incomes, poorer health, and experience more substandard housing conditions than other lower-income workers.

Agricultural workers are typically categorized into 3 groups: 1) permanent, 2) seasonal, and 3) migrant. Permanent agricultural workers are typically employed year-round by the same employer. A seasonal agricultural worker works on average less than 150 days per year and earns at least half of his/her income from agricultural work. A migrant agricultural worker is a seasonal agricultural worker who has to travel to his/her permanent residence within the same day.

According to the 2012 Census of Agriculture, there were 804 permanent and seasonal agricultural workers working on 132 farms in Alameda County. As shown in the table below, the vast majority, 112 (85%), of farms employ fewer than 10 employees--accounting for 34 percent of the workers. Larger farms account for 15% of all farms in the County, but employ 66% of all agricultural workers.

Table II-49: Number of Agricultural Operations and Agricultural Workers 2012, Alameda County

Description	Farms	Workers
<i>Farms with fewer than 10 workers</i>		
Permanent (150 days or more)	60	110
Seasonal (less than 150 days)	77	190
<i>Total with less than 10 workers</i>	137	300
<i>Farms with 10 or more workers</i>		
Permanent (150 days or more)	7	245
Seasonal (less than 150 days)	14	259
<i>Total with 10 or more workers</i>	21	504
TOTAL	158	804

Source: Planning Department, Census of Agriculture 2012

According to the 2002 and 2007 Census of Agriculture, the total number of hired agricultural workers increased in the County by 27% between 2002 and 2007. During this same period, the percentage of agricultural workers employed seasonally doubled, while the percentage of agricultural workers employed on a permanent basis decreased by 19%.

Table II-50: Change in Number of Agricultural Workers 2007-2012, Alameda County

Description	2007		2012		Change, 2007-2012	Percent Change
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Total Number of Hired Farm Workers	1,202		804		-398	-33%
Worked More than 150 Days Per Year	465	39%	355	44%	-110	-24%
Worked Less than 150 Days Per Year	737	61%	449	56%	-288	-39%

Source: Planning Department, Census of Agriculture, 2007 and 2012

According to the California Department of Labor, the median annual wages in the 1st quarter of 2012 for farm workers and laborers was \$21,702. To address the likely housing needs of the farm-working poor, the County adopted an ordinance that recognizes temporary agricultural caretaker dwellings as a permitted use rather than requiring a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). In addition, the ordinance requires a Site Development Review process for new and continued occupancy of those dwellings within the "A" (Agriculture) District.

The County determined that the best mechanism to streamline the permit process for all permits requesting new or continued occupancy of an agricultural caretaker unit was to use the existing Site Development Review (SDR) process, combined with submittal of an Agricultural Caretaker Dwelling Report (ACDR). The ACDR is a simple checklist developed with the Alameda County Fire Department and agricultural community representatives that includes the fire requirements and pertinent planning information such as: activity on the property (ranching or dry farming, etc.), intensity (number of animals - horse, cattle, other), and compliance information for fire, health, grading, etc.

Significant advantages of the SDR process are: a) it is equitable; b) costs are minimal over

time; c) a public hearing is optional; d) the application can be reviewed every five years; and e) the application would retain the same application number throughout the life of the land use, thus “securing” the existing regulations in place.

Typical SDR conditions of approval for new caretaker dwellings would require the applicant to implement all requirements and obtain permits from the Fire Department, Building Inspection Department and Environmental Health Agency for private sewage disposal system and potable water supply within a specific time frame.

The SDR process for agricultural caretaker dwelling units and agricultural employee housing is consistent with applicable provisions of the Employee Housing Act (Health and Safety Code Sections 17000-17062.5) for the following reasons:

- All new housing units in the A district, regardless of their intended occupants, are subject to a SDR, and is therefore this requirement complies with §17021.5.
- The following agricultural activities within an A District are subject to either a SDR or CUP: killing and dressing of livestock, packing house for fruits and vegetables, winery or olive mill related uses, or a composting facility. As a result, the County contends that to require agricultural employee housing “consisting of no more than 36 beds in a group quarters or 12 units “ to be granted approval via an SDR is consistent with §17021.6.

Extremely Low-Income Households

Extremely low-income households are defined as those households with incomes under 30 percent of the county median income. Extremely low-income households typically consist of minimum wage workers, seniors on fixed incomes, persons with disabilities, and farmworkers. This income group is likely to live in overcrowded and substandard housing conditions. In Unincorporated Alameda County, a household of four persons with an income of \$27,600 in 2014 is considered an extremely low-income household. In 2011, there were 5,745 extremely low-income households (12.3%) in Unincorporated Alameda County. As shown earlier in Table II-21, Unincorporated Alameda County had a much larger percentage of extremely low-income renter households (57%) than owner households (43%).

HUD defines households with “any housing problem” as those with a housing cost burden greater than 30 percent of income, and/or overcrowding, and/or without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities. About 85 percent of extremely low-income renters experienced housing problems (see Table II-35 above), and 62 percent of extremely low-income owner households had experienced housing problems. Overall, more than 77 percent of all households experienced housing problems.

Government Code Section 65583(a)(1) states:

“Local agencies shall calculate the subset of very low-income households allotted under Section 65584 that qualify as extremely low-income households. The local agency may either use available census data to calculate the percentage of very low-income households that qualify as extremely low-income households or presume that 50 percent of the very low-income households qualify as extremely low-income households. The number of extremely low-income households and very low-income households shall equal the jurisdiction's allocation of very low-income households pursuant to Section 65584.”

The County has an RHNA allocation of 430 very low-income units. Pursuant to State law (AB 2634, Lieber), the County must project the housing needs of extremely low-income households

based on Census income distribution, or assume 50% of the very low-income units as extremely low-income units. In the absence of income data for the extremely low-income households, 50% of the very low-income units are assumed to be extremely low-income. Therefore, the County's RHNA of 430 very low-income units may be divided into 215 extremely low-income units and 215 very low-income units.

HOUSING STOCK

Total Housing Units

The most recent data on the number of housing units broken down by the unincorporated neighborhoods of the County are from the 2010 Census. According to the Census, Castro Valley saw the greatest numerical increase in housing units between 2000 and 2010 (1,389 units), while Fairview experienced the largest percentage increase, at 9 percent. The Unincorporated remainder areas saw a drop of about 691 units. Some of these units may have been lost due to annexation by cities. The following table illustrates these changes to the housing stock in the Unincorporated County.

Table II-51: Change in Total Housing Units by CDP, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000-2010

Place	2000	2010	Difference 2000-2010	Percent Change 2000-2010
Ashland CDP	7,372	7,758	386	5%
Castro Valley CDP	22,003	23,392	1,389	6%
Cherryland CDP	4,823	4,975	152	3%
Fairview CDP	3,351	3,642	291	9%
San Lorenzo CDP	7,609	7,674	65	1%
Sunol CDP	503	394	-109	-22%
Remainder	1,868	1,177	-691	-37%
TOTAL	49,529	51,022	1,493	3%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census Counts, Table DP-1

Multi-family vs. Single Family

The types of housing units that have been developed vary between local jurisdictions. The same is true for neighborhoods in the Unincorporated County. The most recent data available for specific neighborhoods in the Unincorporated County come from the 2012 American Community Survey. These data show that some areas, such as Fairview, are largely composed of single-family dwellings, while other areas, such as Ashland, have a significant percentage of multi-family units. The following table presents information on housing type by area of the Unincorporated County as of 2012.

Table II-52: Housing Type by Place, Alameda County CDPs, 2008-2012 Estimates

Place	Total Housing Units	1 Unit	2-4 Units	5-19 Units	20 Or More Units	Mobile Home	Boat, RV, Van, etc.
Ashland CDP	7,757	3,933	761	1,164	1,751	131	17
	100.0%	50.7%	9.8%	15.0%	22.6%	1.7%	0.2%
Castro Valley CDP	23,097	18,541	1,060	1,134	1,972	362	28
	100.0%	80.3%	4.6%	4.9%	8.5%	1.6%	0.1%
Cherryland CDP	4,823	3,160	528	795	298	42	0
	100.0%	65.6%	11.0%	16.5%	6.2%	0.9%	0.0%
Fairview CDP	3,584	3,309	40	133	92	10	0
	100.0%	92.3%	1.1%	3.7%	2.6%	0.3%	0.0%
San Lorenzo CDP	7,637	6,813	198	80	442	104	0
	100.0%	89.2%	2.6%	1.1%	5.8%	1.4%	0.0%
Sunol CDP	402	379	0	0	0	23	0
	100.0%	94.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.7%	0.0%

Source: Planning Department, American Community Survey 5 year Estimates (2008-2012), Table DP04

ABAG data compiled from the Department of Finance, shows that when compared to the County as a whole, as shown in Table II-53, Unincorporated Alameda County has higher percentages of both single family detached residences (68% vs. 53%) and mobile homes (2% vs. 1%). In 2013, the predominant housing type in the Unincorporated County is the single-family home, representing seventy-six percent of all housing units. Multi-family units in buildings of five or more units represent only sixteen percent of all units in unincorporated neighborhoods, as opposed to twenty-seven percent County-wide. Multi-family units in buildings of two to four units represent six percent of all units in the Unincorporated County, as opposed to eleven percent County-wide. Twenty-two percent of all housing in Unincorporated Alameda County consists of two or more units. This percentage is less than the 38 percent reported County-wide. These differences reflect historic development patterns in the more urban cities as compared to the Unincorporated County which is composed of communities that are not only urban, but also suburban and rural.

The change in total units by housing type (Table II-52) is also informative. According to data compiled by ABAG and derived from the 2000 Census and DOF, single family attached units had the largest relative increase in total number of units constructed (18.8%) followed by mobile homes (16.1%). Despite these increases, the largest share of housing units within Unincorporated Alameda County are detached single family residences. Data comparing the development of single family and multi-family housing is further analyzed in the section which follows.

Table II-53: Change in Total Housing Units by Type, 2000-2013

Housing Type	2000	2013	Difference	Percent Change
1 unit Detached	33,765	34,490	725	2.1%
1 unit Attached	3,473	4,126	653	18.8%
2-4 Units	3,312	3,118	-194	-5.9%
5+ Units	8,148	8,346	198	2.4%
Mobile Homes	831	965	134	16.1%
Total Housing Units	49,529	51,045	1,516	3.1%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Table II-54: Housing Units by Type, Unincorporated Alameda County vs. Alameda County as a Whole, 2013

Housing Type	Unincorporated		Alameda County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 unit Detached	34,490	68%	311,246	53%
1 unit Attached	4,126	8%	44,965	8%
2-4 units	3,118	6%	65,581	11%
5+ units	8,346	16%	156,845	27%
Mobile Homes	965	2%	7,837	1%
Total Housing Units	51,045	100%	586,474	100%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

Age of Housing Stock

The age of housing, when correlated with income and the proportion of rental housing, can provide a reasonable measure of housing condition. Empirical evidence suggests that communities with high proportions of housing more than 40 years old, lower-income households, and rental housing will usually have a higher proportion of housing in need of repair than similar communities with higher incomes and a higher proportion of ownership housing.

As housing stock ages, an increasing percentage of units are in need of rehabilitation. Generally, housing older than 30 years of age will require minor repairs and modernization improvements. Housing units over 50 years of age are more likely to require major rehabilitation such as roofing, plumbing, and electrical system repairs. Table II-54 provides statistics on the age of the housing units in each unincorporated CDP. An estimated 84 percent of the housing units in the County are over 30 years of age and nearly 50 percent are over 50 years of age.

As these units continue to age, many will require significant reinvestment to maintain. Using the number of units built before 1950 as an indicator of the number of units that may be in need of rehabilitation, County staff has estimated that about 2,669 units (about 25% of the housing stock built before 1950 in the unincorporated areas) may require major repair and rehabilitation.

Table II-55: Age of Housing Stock by Unit, Unincorporated Alameda County CDPs, 2007-2011 Estimates

Place	2000 or later	1990-99	1980-89	1970-79	1960-69	1940-59	1939 or earlier	Units
Ashland	414	410	897	1,155	1,301	2,983	567	7,727
Castro Valley	782	3,334	2,051	2,989	3,886	9,133	888	23,063
Cherryland	375	584	762	398	440	1,882	460	4,901
Fairview	179	231	794	765	368	1,063	80	3,480
San Lorenzo	153	270	231	442	413	5,925	160	7,594
Sunol	12	23	20	60	14	48	193	370
Remainder	507	490	286	265	514	586	353	3,001
TOTAL	2,422	5,342	5,041	6,074	6,936	21,620	2,701	50,136
Percent of Total	4.8%	10.7%	10.1%	12.1%	13.8%	43.1%	5.4%	100.0%

Source: Planning Department, American Community Survey 5 year Estimates (2007-2011), Table DP04

Note:

There are high Margins of Error (MOE), approximately 1 to 9 percent, associated with the 2007-2011 ACS data. Generally, the larger the population used in an estimate the lower the MOE. Small sub-populations generally have very high margins of error and are less reliable. However, as there was not a 2010 long form census conducted, this is the only recent data source available for these types of data.

Vacancy

Vacancy rate is often a good indicator of how effectively for-sale and rental units are meeting the current demand for housing in a community. In California, vacancy rates of 6 or 7 percent for rental housing and 1 to 2 percent for ownership housing are generally considered “normal”, where there is a balance between the demand and supply for housing.⁸ A higher vacancy rate may indicate an excess supply of units and, therefore, price depreciation, while a low vacancy rate may indicate a shortage of units and escalation of housing prices. The availability of vacant housing units provides households with choices on different unit types to accommodate changing needs (e.g., single persons, newly married couples and elderly households typically need smaller units than households with school age children). The availability of housing is also linked to overcrowding which was discussed earlier in this chapter.

Of the 51,022 units reported in the 2010 Census, 2,506 were vacant; therefore, Unincorporated Alameda County had an overall vacancy rate of 4.9 percent and an effective vacancy rate (only counting those properties available for lease or purchase) of 2.8% in 2010. The homeowner vacancy rate was 0.9 percent in 2010 and the rental vacancy rate was 1.9 percent. The vacancy rate has more than doubled from 1.1 percent in 2000 to 2.8 percent in 2010. While this increase is indeed significant, it must be noted that the effective vacancy rate for the County as

⁸ State Department of Housing and Community Development, The State of Housing in California: 2012 Update, August 2012; Giang Hoang-Burdette, Nobody’s Home: California Residential Vacancy Rates, May 9, 2012; and Joan C. Fahrenthold, Associated Press, America’s Sickest Housing Markets, 2012

a whole was 8.2% in 2010. Table II-55 provides additional information on the types and number of vacancies reported in 2000 and 2010.

Table II-56: Vacancy Rates, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2010

Vacancy Type	2000			2010		
	Number of Units	Percent of Vacancies	Percent of Housing Units	Number of Units	Percent of Vacancies	Percent of Housing Units
For rent	328	30.9%	0.7%	980	39.1%	1.9%
For sale only	205	19.3%	0.4%	435	17.4%	0.9%
Rented or Sold, not occupied	128	12.1%	0.3%	194	7.7%	0.4%
For seasonal, recreational, or occasional use	106	10.0%	0.2%	152	6.1%	0.3%
For migrant workers	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Other vacant	294	27.7%	0.6%	745	29.7%	1.5%
Total Vacant	1,061	100.0%	2.1%	2,506	100.0%	4.9%
Effective vacancy rate	533	----	1.1%	1,415	----	2.8%
Total Units			49,529			51,022

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

The table below shows that between 2000 and 2010 the number of vacancies increased in Unincorporated Alameda County. This is despite a 4 percent population increase over the same period. In 2000 the overall vacancy rate was 2.1 percent. In 2010, the rate would more than double to 4.9 percent. This data suggests that more people may be choosing to live together, rather than purchasing or renting separate units. The increased number of vacancies is also possibly linked to the large number of foreclosures. With the exception of Fairview and Sunol, unincorporated communities experienced an increase in the average household size (Table II-15). Increased vacancies (Table II-55) and household size are both directly related to overcrowding, as is the impact of inflation on median income (Table II-24).

Table II-57: Change in Vacancy Rates, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2000 to 2010

Vacancy Type	2000	2010	Difference 2000-2010	Percent Change 2000-2010
Units For Rent	328	980	652	199%
Units For Sale Only	205	435	230	112%
Units Rented or Sold, Not Occupied	128	194	66	52%
Units For Seasonal, Recreational, or Occasional Use	106	152	46	43%
Units For Migrant Workers	0	0	0	--
Other Vacant Units	294	745	451	153%
Total Vacant Units	1,061	2506	1,445	136%

Source: Planning Department, ABAG Data Warehouse 2013

HOUSING COST AND AFFORDABILITY

Housing affordability is a concern for many people in the community as demonstrated by the data on overpayment provided in the section entitled “Housing Problems”. Affordability is defined as paying 30 percent or less of gross monthly household income on housing costs, based on both State and Federal standards. The following table uses 2014 HUD Income levels to derive affordable housing costs for the Oakland PMSA.

Table II-58: Housing Affordability

Number of Persons in Household	HUD Income Limits		Estimated Monthly Housing Costs		Estimated Maximum Affordable Price	
	Max. Annual Income	Affordable Total Monthly Payment	Utilities ¹	Taxes and Insurance (for Homeowners)	Ownership ²	Monthly Rental ³
Extremely Low						
One Person	\$19,350	\$484	\$75	\$150	\$58,050	\$409
Two Person	\$22,100	\$553	\$100	\$163	\$66,300	\$453
Three Person	\$24,850	\$621	\$125	\$174	\$74,550	\$496
Four Person	\$27,600	\$690	\$150	\$186	\$82,800	\$540
Very Low						
One Person	\$32,200	\$805	\$75	\$203	\$96,600	\$730
Two Person	\$36,800	\$920	\$100	\$226	\$110,400	\$820
Three Person	\$41,400	\$1,035	\$125	\$246	\$124,200	\$910
Four Person	\$46,000	\$1,150	\$150	\$266	\$138,000	\$1,000
Low						
One Person	\$47,350	\$1,184	\$75	\$271	\$142,050	\$1,109
Two Person	\$54,100	\$1,353	\$100	\$301	\$162,300	\$1,253
Three Person	\$60,850	\$1,521	\$125	\$330	\$182,550	\$1,396
Four Person	\$67,600	\$1,690	\$150	\$359	\$202,800	\$1,540
Moderate						
One Person	\$77,400	\$1,935	\$75	\$401	\$232,200	\$1,860
Two Person	\$88,400	\$2,210	\$100	\$450	\$265,200	\$2,110
Three Person	\$99,400	\$2,485	\$125	\$497	\$298,200	\$2,360
Four Person	\$110,400	\$2,760	\$150	\$545	\$331,200	\$2,610

Source: Planning Department, 2014 HUD User Data, Oakland PMSA

Notes:

- (1) Monthly utility costs are assumed as \$75/person and \$25 for each additional person.
- (2) Total affordable mortgage based on a 10 percent down payment, an annual 4.5 percent interest rate, 30-year mortgage, and monthly payment equal to 30 percent of income (after utilities, taxes, and insurance).
- (3) Monthly affordable rent based on 30 percent of income less estimated utilities costs.

Homeownership Housing Costs

The National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) reports annually on home affordability for each statistical area in the United States. This “opportunity index” is the percentage of

households that can afford to purchase a home valued at the median for the area. Since 2001, the County has tracked the affordability index for the Oakland – Fremont-Hayward area.

Table II-58 shows the median sales prices for homes in the Oakland-Fremont-Hayward area, during the first quarter (January-March) of 2001 to 2013. The area includes eastern Alameda County. The median sales price significantly increased between 2003 and 2006. Between 2007 and 2009, the median sales price decreased, making housing more affordable. While prices rose slightly in 2010, they decreased in 2011 to 2012. The median sales price of \$270,000 in 2012 was still out of reach for lower-income families, but within reach for some moderate-income families in Alameda County. The NAHB’s analysis indicated that the median sales price had increased by 33 percent to \$339,000. It is likely that housing prices will continue this upward trend during the Housing Element planning period. It is worth noting that while prices did decline, NAHB estimated that the median income necessary for a median priced home to be considered “affordable” steadily increased. This may be the result of increased scrutiny by lenders of borrowers. While the drop in median home prices proved beneficial to some, many borrowers would still be unable to become homeowners.

Table II-59: Housing Opportunity Index, First Quarter, 2001-2013

Year	Median Price	Housing Opportunity Index ¹	Median Income ²
2001	\$330,000	26.1%	\$71,600
2002	\$350,000	23.9%	\$74,500
2003	\$402,000	22.5%	\$76,600
2004	\$420,000	26.6%	\$82,200
2005	\$500,000	15.2%	\$81,200
2006	\$555,000	9.4%	\$83,800
2007	\$533,000	11.4%	\$83,000
2008	\$400,000	32.4%	\$86,100
2009	\$248,000	73.8%	\$89,300
2010	\$281,000	64.0%	\$90,758
2011	\$270,000	68.8%	\$90,300
2012	\$255,000	75.3%	\$93,454
2013	\$339,000	65.8%	\$92,637

Source: Alameda County Planning Department, NAHB Housing Opportunity Index

Notes:

- (1) Percentage of households that can afford to purchase a median priced home.
- (2) Median income of persons who purchased a home during the first quarter of that year.

Table II-59 compares the median home prices within Alameda County from 2012 to 2013. All communities surveyed had increases in median home prices. Data are not tracked separately for the unincorporated neighborhoods of Ashland, Cherryland or Fairview. Ashland numbers are reported in San Leandro data and Fairview and Cherryland are reported in Hayward data. However, among unincorporated communities with disaggregated data, San Lorenzo experienced the greatest increase in median home prices over the period.

In June 2014, DataQuick (a real estate statistical service) published a comparison of the median home prices in May 2013 and May 2014 for the County, cities, and unincorporated communities. Unfortunately, DataQuick does not publish separate monthly data for Ashland, Cherryland and Fairview. In general, it shows that housing inventory is not keeping up with demand. The

number of properties available for purchase in Alameda County as a whole decreased (-7.59%), while the median sales price has increased (17.35%). The data is provided in Table II-60.

Table II-60: Sales Data for Year End 2013

Place	# Sold	Median 2013	Median 2012	Percent Change
Alameda County	18,129	\$485,000	\$365,000	32.88%
Alameda	631	\$588,000	\$499,000	17.84%
Albany	185	\$603,000	\$455,000	32.53%
Berkeley	713	\$720,000	\$595,000	21.01%
Castro Valley CDP	733	\$534,500	\$418,000	27.87%
Dublin	1,373	\$678,000	\$549,000	23.50%
Emeryville	501	\$350,000	\$235,000	48.94%
Fremont	2,563	\$605,000	\$475,000	27.37%
Hayward	1,858	\$360,000	\$262,000	37.40%
Livermore	1,530	\$505,000	\$415,000	21.69%
Newark	520	\$434,000	\$340,000	27.65%
Oakland	4,150	\$390,000	\$264,000	47.73%
Pleasanton	1,012	\$750,000	\$635,500	18.02%
San Leandro	992	\$380,000	\$283,750	33.92%
San Lorenzo CDP	351	\$370,000	\$280,000	32.14%
Sunol CDP	7	\$707,500	\$650,000	8.85%
Union City	694	\$470,000	\$360,000	30.56%

Source: DQ News

Table II-61: Median House Prices May 2013 vs. May 2014

Place	# Sold May 2014	# Sold May 2013	% Change Yr-to-Yr	Median \$ May 2014	Median \$ May 2013	% Change Yr-to-Yr
Alameda County	1,560	1,688	-7.59%	\$575,000	\$490,000	17.35%
Alameda	50	63	-20.63%	\$675,000	\$639,000	5.63%
Albany	21	18	16.70%	\$611,000	\$488,000	25.20%
Berkeley	62	65	-4.62%	\$680,000	\$730,000	-6.85%
Castro Valley	61	64	-4.68%	\$602,250	\$525,000	14.71%
Dublin	96	143	-32.90%	\$788,000	\$655,500	20.21%
Emeryville	54	40	35.00%	\$410,000	\$353,500	15.98%
Fremont	247	255	-3.14%	\$738,500	\$621,500	18.83%
Hayward	133	171	-22.21%	\$425,000	\$355,000	19.72%
Livermore	112	153	-26.83%	\$610,000	\$521,750	16.91%
Newark	49	46	6.50%	\$500,000	\$466,500	7.18%
Oakland	409	349	17.19%	\$478,500	\$399,000	19.92%
Pleasanton	103	52	98.15%	\$875,000	\$765,000	14.38%
San Leandro	75	85	-11.76%	\$441,000	\$380,000	16.05%
San Lorenzo	26	93	-72.04%	\$416,000	\$359,500	15.72%
Sunol	2	34	-94.12%	\$917,500	\$627,500	46.22%
Union City	45	57	-21.10%	\$521,000	\$430,750	20.95%

Source: Planning Department, DQ News

According to analysis from the East Bay Economic Development Alliance (EBEDA), a rapid decrease in the number of lower-value distressed properties on the market has contributed to a substantial increase in home prices in the East Bay. As home inventories remain very low by historical standards, the EBEDA expects home prices to continue to rise. Despite the increase in home prices in the past year, home affordability remains near an all-time high. Even as home prices appreciate faster than incomes in the Bay Area, interest rates on mortgages remain so low that homes are about as inexpensive as they were at the end of 2011, and as inexpensive in the East Bay as they were upon the onset of the recession in late 2007, at 34.5% of income. Compare this to the peak of the housing bubble, when home costs in the East Bay were as high as 93% of income.

Rental Housing Costs

Table II-59 shows HUD-defined fair market rent levels (FMR) for the Oakland-Fremont PMSA for 2014. In general, the FMR for an area is the amount that would be needed to pay the gross rent (shelter rent plus utilities) of privately owned, decent, safe, and sanitary rental housing of a modest (non-luxury) nature with suitable amenities.

HUD uses FMRs for a variety of purposes: FMRs determine the eligibility of rental housing units for the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments program; Section 8 Rental Certificate program participants cannot rent units whose rents exceed the FMRs; and FMRs also serve as the payment standard used to calculate subsidies under the Rental Voucher program.

The level at which FMRs are set is expressed as a percentile point within the rent distribution of standard quality rental housing units in the FMR area. The basic standard for the FMR figures in the Oakland-Fremont PMSA is the 40th percentile. In other words, 60 percent of the rents in the Oakland-Fremont PMSA are above the figures shown and 40 percent are below. When the FMR is evaluated against affordability criteria, one sees that unsubsidized units remain out of reach for many people within the community.

Table II-62: HUD Fair Market Rate, Oakland-Fremont PMSA, 2014

Unit Type	Rent	Minimum Income Required ¹	Income Level Range ²	Occupancy ³
Efficiency	\$1,035	\$41,400	Low	1-2 persons
One-Bedroom	\$1,255	\$50,200	Low-Median	1-2 persons
Two-Bedroom	\$1,578	\$63,120	Low-Median	2-3 persons
Three-Bedroom	\$2,204	\$88,160	Median-Moderate	3-5 persons
Four-Bedroom	\$2,704	\$108,160	Moderate	4-6 persons

Source: Planning Department, HUD User Data

Notes:

- (1) Monthly payment based on 30 percent of income
- (2) Income level based on HUD income limits
- (3) 2 persons per bedroom maximum. Average occupancy per bedroom does not exceed 1.5 persons.

While FMR's provide a rent estimate by unit sizes, these amounts are not actual rents but a cap of what HUD will allow reimbursement of rents to be. We know through data from RealFacts that the average rents for the unincorporated county are \$1700 per month (<http://www.bls.gov/cpi/tables.htm>).

Units at Risk of Conversion to Market Rate

State Housing Element law requires that all Housing Elements include information about the number of existing subsidized housing units that are “at-risk” of conversion to other, non-low-income housing uses (such as market-rate housing). Units at risk of conversion are those units in which the restrictions, agreements or contracts to maintain the affordability of the units will expire or are otherwise terminated soon. At expiration, units may revert to market rate, rendering them no longer affordable to the people living in them or the general public. Loss of affordability can occur at the termination of bond financing or restrictions, the expiration of density bonuses or contracts for Project –based Section 8 housing assistance, and other similar local programs. The analysis of at-risk units is required to identify and describe the potentially at-risk projects, analyze the cost of preserving them as affordable housing, describe available resources which can be used for preservation, and set quantified objectives for preservation of affordable at-risk units.

Currently, there are a total of 1,103 affordable restricted units in the unincorporated county. Of the 1,103, staff determined that there are a total of 44 units in one development that are at risk of conversion in this Housing Element planning period.

Projects are considered “High Risk” if they are owned by private, for-profit entities and their subsidies/financing restrictions are due to expire or convert during the planning period of this housing element. Projects are considered at “Low Risk” if they are owned by nonprofit housing corporations or if their regulatory restrictions expire after this planning period for the Housing Element.

The following table highlights the current inventory of projects, those that are at high risk and those that are low risk. This table shows the project name, the owner type (nonprofit, private, etc.), the total number of units in the development, the number of those that are income-restricted, the income levels of the restricted units, the potential conversion date, and an analysis of the level of conversion risk for each development.

Table II-63: Inventory of Subsidized Rental Housing in Unincorporated Alameda County, April 2014

Project Name	Owner Type	Program (Subsidy)	Total Units	Restricted Units	Conversion Date	Income Level	Risk Analysis
Sparksway Commons	Cooperative	RHCP	45	44	2013	50%;80% Md	High
<i>Sub-total</i>			45	44			
Grove Way	Non Profit	Mod Rehab/Sec. 8	8	8	Annual Renewal	50% Md	Low
Wittenberg Manor I	Non Profit	231/Sec.8	95	92	2033	80% Md	Low
Wittenberg Manor II	Non Profit	Sec.202/CDBG	63	63	2033	50% Md	Low
Pacheco Court	Non Profit	SHP/CDBG	10	10	2052	30%;50% Md	Low
Banyan Street	Non Profit	CDBG/HOME	8	8	2057	50% Md	Low
Bermuda Gardens	Non Profit	CDBG/HOME/Redevelopment	80	80	2057	30%;50%;60%	Low
Concord House	Non Profit	SHP/HOPE/HOPWA	8	8	2057	30%;50% Md	Low
Eden House Apts.	Non Profit	LIHPREA	116	116	2057	80% Md	Low
South County Sober Hsg	Non Profit	CDBG	8	8	2057	SSI/GA	Low
Strobridge Apts.	Non Profit	LIHTC/HOME/Loc.	96	96	2057	50%;60% Md	Low
Hayward Village	Private	LIHTC/4% BOND	151	151	2058	80% Md	Low
Lorenzo Creek Apartments	Non Profit	LIHTC/HOME/CDBG/Loc.	28	28	2059	50% Md	Low
Quail Run Apts.	Private	County Bond/Tax Credits	104	51	2061	80% Md	Low
Kent Gardens	Non Profit	HUD 202/HOME/Trust Fund	84	84	2062	50% Md	Low
Siena Point	Private	HOME/Trust Fund/LIHTF/Bond	109	99	2062	50%,80% Md	Low
Ashland Village Apts.	Non Profit	221d4/Sec.8	142	142	2063	80% Md	Low
<i>Sub-total</i>			1,110	1,044			
Total			1,155	1,088			

Source: Alameda County HCD, April 2014

Sparksway Commons is the only development that is at-risk during this planning period. It represents 4.1% of the unincorporated County's restricted affordable housing supply.

Sparksway Commons is a tenant cooperative, funded by the state of California's rental housing construction program (RHCP). The program provides an operating subsidy so that residents do not pay more than 25 percent of their incomes in rent. The current subsidy and restrictions expired in 2013. The project has a total of 45 units, 44 of which are restricted to households at 50% and 80% of median income. The project is under cooperative ownership, and nonprofit management. Since it is a cooperative ownership, it is somewhat different from rental housing in terms of conversion. However, without the state subsidy, the affordable monthly payments residents currently pay would not be able to cover the costs of maintaining and managing the development. It is not clear what the State intends to do about these contracts, but FY 14 funds were provided to the project. It is expected that the funds will be approved on a year to year basis.

COST ANALYSIS OF PRESERVING "AT-RISK" PROJECTS

Given the ownership structure of the project, and the difficulty in finding an additional operating subsidy for the current tenant owners of Sparksway Commons, it is likely that the project will have to raise rents significantly to cover costs should the State not renew its subsidy contract in future years. At that time, low income households may be displaced.

The cost of producing an affordable unit to replace a lost unit is extremely high. For example, recent developments that have been supported with County funds have had local subsidies ranging from \$80,000 to \$200,000 per unit. The average local subsidy on these projects is between \$100,000 and \$150,000 per unit for the units locally restricted. The total development costs would likely be over \$20 million and would require substantial state and federal sources to build. In general, the cost of preserving affordable units is less than the cost of replacement.

Preservation of at risk units can be accomplished in several ways, including acquisition of the property by qualified nonprofit housing corporations, local housing authorities, or other organizations that are committed to long-term affordable housing. As a part of the financing of this type of acquisition, long-term regulatory restrictions are recorded against the property, removing the risk of conversion. In projects where only a portion of the units are restricted, long term project-based subsidies can be put in place to preserve the affordability.

The costs of preservation are significantly lower than the costs of replacement. Based on the current market conditions, rental units in the Unincorporated County can be acquired for between \$100,000 and \$190,000 per unit depending on location, size, and condition. The cost to acquire the 45 identified high-risk units ranges from \$4.5 million to \$8.5 million. Additional costs to rehabilitate the units would range from between \$80,000 and \$150,000 per unit, making the total project costs between \$6.75 million and \$13.5 million to complete. Since the units are restricted to families with incomes at or below 80% of median income, the project may be able to carry some debt service and attract tax credit investments. Therefore, the actual subsidy required to preserve all 44 units is less than the total project costs (acquisition cost plus rehab cost). Current projects administered by the County have required subsidy levels of approximately \$150,000 per unit. Based on this assumption, the subsidy costs of the preservation of the 45 high-risk units is approximately \$4.5 million. This cost would be further reduced if the Housing Authority is able to place project based Section 8 vouchers at the sites at the time of purchase.

AVAILABLE RESOURCES FOR PRESERVATION

The County will actively work with the State of California, the owner and the nonprofit property manager to preserve the affordability of Sparksway Commons.

Potential resources include the Unincorporated County share of HOME funds, which are awarded through an RFP process within the Urban County, Unincorporated County share of Community Development Block Grant funds, and local Housing Trust Fund monies. It is also possible that funds from other State and Federal programs could be obtained to support preservation efforts. The Alameda County Housing Authority administers the Section 8 voucher program in the Unincorporated County, including project based vouchers. Tenant subsidies, such as Section 8, are another potential means to preserve affordable housing at Sparksway Commons. Section 8 preservation tools may include the Mark-Up-to-Market program, which provides incentives for for-profit property owners to remain in the Section 8 program after their contracts expire. The Mark-Up-to-Market program allows non-profit owners to increase below-market rents to acquire new property or make capital repairs while preserving existing Section 8 units. For above-market properties Mark-to-Market provides owners with debt restructuring in exchange for renewal of Section 8 contracts for 30 years. At the State level, the California Housing Finance Agency offers low-interest loans to preserve long-term affordability for multifamily rental properties through its Preservation Acquisition Finance Program. The Division of Financial Assistance also offers the Multifamily Housing Program (MHP), which provides deferred payment loans for preservation of permanent and transitional rental housing, as well as new construction and rehabilitation.

Available public and non-profit organizations with the capacity to preserve assisted housing developments in Unincorporated Alameda County includes:

- Eden Housing
- Mercy Housing
- BRIDGE Housing
- Allied Housing
- Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency (BOSS)
- East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation
- Affordable Housing Associates
- Resources for Community Development

A complete list of organizations that have been determined by State HCD to be qualified for developing and preserving affordable housing is included as Appendix G.

CHAPTER III- HOUSING CONSTRAINTS

Housing Element law requires that local jurisdictions identify potential constraints to the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels, including housing for persons with disabilities. This analysis must determine whether or not a jurisdiction's regulations pose an actual constraint and must describe how the jurisdiction will address that constraint over the planning period.

The analysis in this section has been used to evaluate whether the County has adequate sites to accommodate its share (1,769 units) of regional housing needs between 2015 and 2023 under the Association of Bay Area Governments Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The analysis of adequate sites is in Chapter III.

Residential development in Alameda County is constrained by many restrictions contained in the General Ordinance Code, Specific Plans, and other regulatory documents. Citizen actions have also caused some of these restrictions. While many of these limitations are based on health and safety concerns, others are based on community preferences. Efforts to allow greater residential development and increased density in parts of Alameda County have, in some cases, been met by opposition in part due to concerns regarding infrastructure deficiencies and past developments. Some constraints reflect equally important goals competing with housing for scarce land and natural resources. Competing goals and interest are inherent in any land use project, and residential development is not exempt from those considerations.

GOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

Local policies and regulations play an important role in protecting the public's health, safety and welfare. However, governmental policies and regulations can act as constraints that affect both the amount of residential development that occurs and housing affordability. State law requires housing elements to "address and where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing" (Government Code Section 65583[c][3]). Therefore, the County must monitor these regulations to ensure there are no unnecessary restrictions on the operation of the housing market. If the County determines that a policy or regulation results in excessive constraints, the County must attempt to identify what steps can be taken to remove or minimize obstacles to affordable residential development.

The term "governmental constraints" refers to the policies and regulations of the County that affect housing development. While the County has little influence on market-oriented (nongovernmental) constraints and other potential obstacles such as interest rates, cost of materials, land costs, and labor costs, the County understands the importance of ensuring its land use policies and regulations do not unduly constrain the free operation of the housing market. Oftentimes local regulations play a legitimate role in protecting the overall public health, safety, and welfare of Alameda County. However, the application of some regulations may restrict the market's ability to provide a variety of housing types commensurate with local needs.

Governmental constraints may include land availability (as regulated by the County's Land Use Element); zoning and other development regulations; building codes and enforcement; permit processing procedures; fees for permits, development impacts, and environmental mitigation; and County financing limitations.

Though typically uniform across a regional housing market, state and federal regulations in concert with current economic trends can affect the availability of land and the cost of producing housing. While these laws serve legitimate public purposes, their cost impact on housing cannot be ignored. Examples of state and federal regulations that affect the cost and availability of housing include environmental laws (such as CEQA), discretionary permit processes, building standards, infrastructure requirements and the availability of financing. State and federal requirements disproportionately affect the cost and availability of housing affordable to lower income households. Some, but not all, of the cost of housing production added by state and federal regulations is offset by funding and tax incentives from the state and federal governments for affordable housing.

The current environment of scarcity in local government finance results in limited opportunities for the County to fund affordable housing programs and projects from local revenues. Historically, one of the primary methods for generating local revenue has been redevelopment, which has been used extensively by the County. This funding source is no longer available due to the dissolution of redevelopment agencies in California (AB1x26, "Dissolution Act"). Financial commitment to affordable housing on the part of the state and federal governments remains essential, because the production of most affordable housing requires significant subsidies beyond those that Alameda County can provide. This section of the Housing Element focuses on key policies and regulations under the County's direct control.

Land Use Controls and Mitigations

Ministerial and discretionary control of residential development is exercised in accordance with the General Plan, the Zoning Ordinance, specific plans, and other implementing ordinances. This section presents an overview of the County's land use policies as they might affect housing development.

Land use controls, such as those contained in the Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinance, and General Plan are intended to promote the orderly development, public health, safety and welfare of the community. The Zoning Ordinance (Title 17 of the Alameda County Code) contains regulations that ensure that land uses in the community are situated properly in relation to each other, such as restrictions on the use, height and bulk of buildings, and requirements for setbacks and parking. The Subdivision Ordinance (Title 16) is concerned with the division of any unit or units of improved or unimproved land for the purpose of sale, lease, or financing. Generally, the Subdivision Ordinance allows the County to address public safety and other concerns by regulating the internal design of streets, lots, public utilities, and other similar infrastructure in each new subdivision.

General Plan

A General Plan is a long range policy document approved by the Board of Supervisors to guide physical, economic, and environmental growth. The County utilizes area plans, which are components of the General Plan, to allow for context-specific community and neighborhood planning. All goals, policies, standards, and implementing actions in each of these plans must be consistent with all other elements of the General Plan.

The General Plan, the County's major land use policy document balances the need for land available for development with the need to provide infrastructure and services efficiently, and the need to protect agricultural and open space resources. The General Plan's objective is to guide development in an efficient and cost-effective manner, while meeting the need for housing, economic growth, continued working agriculture, and habitat protection. The General Plan promotes efficiency by committing to a pattern of land use that provides a concentrated

mix of uses in areas where public infrastructure already exists. More concentrated development protects valuable agricultural lands, helps to conserve natural areas and resources, reduces travel distance and air pollution emissions, conserves energy, and enhances the efficiency of infrastructure and services.

As part of the General Plan, the Housing Element seeks to accommodate the County's housing needs for all income levels, and to remove regulatory barriers to meeting those needs, while also contributing to other General Plan goals and objectives for the protection of the environment, health and safety of residents, and the quality of life in Alameda County.

The following is a list of these area plans :

- Castro Valley (2012)
- Eden Area (2010)
- East County Area (1994, amended by Measure D in 2000)

The County's General Plan includes three areas plans which contain land use and circulation elements for their respective geographic areas, as well as area-specific goals, policies, and actions for open space, conservation, safety and noise.

The rezonings that occurred in 2005 and 2006 as the result of the 2003 Housing Element Implementation program provide enough sites to support the current and projected housing needs for the unincorporated areas. Tables III-1, III-2, and III-3 generally describe the land use designations specified in the Alameda County General Plan and their related zoning districts.

Specific Plans

A specific plan is a tool for implementing the General Plan. It is the link between the goals and policies of the General Plan and the development of a defined geographical area. A specific plan provides the standards for development within designated parts of the unincorporated county. Currently available specific plans:

- Ashland and Cherryland Business Districts (1993)
- Castro Valley Central Business District (1994)
- Fairview Area (1997)
- Madison Avenue (2006)
- San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan (2004)
- Little Valley (1997)

Planning staff believes that the range of density categories, land uses, and zoning provided in these specific plans adequately respond to housing demand. Refinements in zoning have occurred in the County's urbanized Unincorporated Areas with the adoptions of the Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan (CBD) and the Ashland and Cherryland Business Districts Specific Plan (ACBD), both of which provide for mixed uses along transit corridors and/or high density residential adjacent to commercial uses. The San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan, introduced housing into areas that have been previously zoned exclusively for commercial uses. The County is in the process of completing a comprehensive update of the Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plan and the Fairview Area Specific Plan.

Table III-1: Land Uses and Zoning, East County Area Plan

Land Use Designation	Parcel Size; Maximum Density	Zoning
Large Parcel Agricultural	100 acre minimum; (1-2 units/per parcel)	Agricultural Districts (A-100, A-160, A-320)
Resource Management	100 acre minimum; (1-2 units/per parcel)	Agricultural Districts (A-100, A-160, A-320)
Water Management Lands	100 acre minimum; (1-2 units/per parcel)	Agricultural Districts (A-100, A-160, A-320)
Rural Density Residential	5 acre minimum parcel; (1 unit/per parcel)	Single Family Residential District (R-1); Limited Agricultural Districts
Low Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 1.0-2.0 units/acre	R-1
Low/Medium Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 2.0-4.0 units/acre	R-1; R-2; R-3; R-4; and R-S
Medium Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 4.1-8.0 units/acre	R-3; R-4 and R-S
Medium/High Density	6,000 square feet minimum; 8.1-12.0 units/acre	R-4 and R-S
High Density	6,000 square feet minimum; 12.1-25.0 units/acre	R-4 and R-S
Very High Density	6,000 square feet minimum; 25.1-75.0 units/acre	R-4 and R-S

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

Table III-2: Land Uses and Zoning, Eden Area General Plan

Land Use Designation	Parcel Size; Maximum Density	Zoning
Low Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 0.0-9.0 units/acre	R-1
Low-Density (Fairview)	5,000 square feet - 5 acres; 0.01-7.0 units/acre	R-1 and R-1-B-E
Low-Medium Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 7.0-12.0 units/acre	R-S; R-2; R-S (D-35); and R-S-DV
Medium Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 10.0-22.0 units/acre	R-3; R-S (D-35); R-S (D-25); R-S(D-20) and R-S-DV
Medium-High Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 8.7-43.0 units/acre	R-4; R-S(D-3); R-S(D-20); and R-S(D-15)
High Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 22.0-43.0 units/acre	R-S(D-20); R-4; R-S(D-3); and R-S(D-15)
Low-Medium Density/General Commercial (GC)	5,000 square feet minimum; 7.0-12.0 units/acre; 1.0 FAR	ACBD-RC
Medium Density/GC	5,000 square feet minimum; 10.0-22.0 units/acre; 1.0 FAR	ACBD-RC; ACBD-TA
Medium-High Density/GC	5,000 square feet minimum; 22.0-43.0 units/acre; 1.0 FAR	ACBD-TA
High Density/GC	5,000 square feet minimum; 43.0-86.0 units/acre; 1.0 FAR	ACBD-TC and ACBD-FA
GC/Medium Density	5,000 square feet minimum;	ACBD-RC; ACBD-TA

Land Use Designation	Parcel Size; Maximum Density	Zoning
	10.0-22.0 units/acre; 1.0 FAR	
GC/Medium-High Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 22.0-43.0 units/acre; 1.0 FAR	ACBD-TA
GC/High Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 43.0-86.0 units/acre; 1.0 FAR	ACBD-TC and ACBD-FA
San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	19.66 units/acre	Not Applicable

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

Table III-3: Land Uses and Zoning, Castro Valley General Plan

Land Use Designation	Parcel Size; Maximum Density	Zoning
Rural Residential	Parcels \geq 20,000 square feet in size; 1.0-2.0 units/acre	R-1(B-40); R-1(B-E, CSU, RV); and R-1(L, B-E)
Hillside Residential	5,000- 10,000 square feet; 4.4-8.7 units/acre	R-1 (B-E, CSU, RV); and R-1 (B-E)
Residential - Single Family	5,000 square feet minimum; 4.4- 8.7 units/acre	R-1
Residential - Small Lot	5,000 square feet minimum; 8.7-17.4 units/acre (2,500, 3,500 or 5,000 square foot Minimum Building Site Area)	R-S; R-2; R-S (D-35); and R-S (D-25)
Residential - Low Density Multi-family	5,000 square feet minimum; 17.4-21.8 units/acre (\geq 2,000 square foot Minimum Building Site Area)	R-3 and R-S(D-20)
Residential - Medium Density Multi-family	5,000 square feet minimum; 21.8-29.0 units/acre (\geq 1,500 square foot Minimum Building Site Area)	R-S(D-3) and R-S(D-15)
Residential - Mixed Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 8.7-29.0 units/acre	R-1; R-2; R-3; R-4; R-S; R-S(D-25); R-S(D-3) and R-S(D-35)
Residential - Downtown Mixed Use	10,000 or 20,000 square feet minimum; 17.4-60.0 units/acre	Portions of CBD Sub-areas, 2,4-11
Residential – Downtown Low Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 10.0 units/acre	Portions of CBD Sub-area 11
Residential – Downtown Medium Density	5,000 square feet minimum; 8.7-29.0 units/acre	Portions of CBD Sub-area 11

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

The Alameda County General Plan is not considered to be a constraint to the goals and policies of the Housing Element as the County's zoning is consistent with the General Plan and adequate sites with appropriate densities have been identified to permit the construction of the

County's fair share of new housing units for the 2015-2023 planning period (see Chapter IV, Sites Inventory and Capacity Analysis).

Residential District Zoning

The County offers a variety of housing opportunities through its land use policies. The five residential districts are the R-1 (Single Family Residence), R-2 (Two Family Residence), R-3 (Four Family Residence), R-4 (Multiple Residence), and R-S (Suburban Residence) Districts. The basic use allowed in each of these districts is residential; however they differ on allowed density. In addition to the residential districts, residential uses are allowed by right in all Agricultural (A) districts and are conditionally permitted in Mixed Use (M-U) districts. The following descriptions summarize the general residential development standards in the Unincorporated areas.

- The R-1 District provides for single-family residential neighborhoods. It is a very widely used district and includes much of the suburbanized part of the County. It allows single-family detached homes on separate lots with a minimum 5,000 square feet lot size/building site area (MBSA) requirement. A lot may be larger than this, but only one residence may be constructed on a lot regardless of the size. A property owner having a larger lot may, under the Subdivision Ordinance, divide the property to create additional lots, each of which must be at least 5,000 square feet in area. Through use of the B Combining District (described below) larger minimum lot sizes may be required such as 10,000 square feet or five acres.
- The R-2 District provides for duplexes. It has limited application; a few neighborhoods are zoned R-2, but it is often used to legalize existing nonconforming duplexes or to address specific circumstances. It also has a 5,000 square foot minimum lot size requirement. Two dwelling units are allowed on each lot; this may be one two-unit or two one-unit structures. On a lot of 7,500 square feet or larger, three dwelling units are allowed as a Conditional Use; these may be a three-unit structure, one two- and one one-unit structure, or three one-unit structures.
- The R-3 District provides for a total of four dwelling units on a lot, but there may be no more than one unit for each 2,000 square feet of lot area with a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet; i.e. up to two units are allowed on a 5,000 square foot lot, three on a 6,000 square foot lot, and four on a 8,000 square foot or larger lot. As with the R-2 District these may be in any combination of one-, two-, three- and four-unit structures. This District is seldom used; generally this type of development is done in the R-S District described below.
- The R-4 District provides for larger multiple residential structures. It requires a 6,000 square foot minimum building site area, and allows one unit for each 1,250 square feet. The R-4 District has other requirements and exceptions for lot coverage and density. Like the R-3 District this District is seldom used.
- The R-S District is the most commonly used district for multi-unit development. It has a basic density requirement of one unit for each 5,000 square feet of lot area, and has a minimum lot size requirement of 5,000 square feet. However, unlike the R-1, R-2, and R-3 Districts, each unit (or group of units) does not have to be on a separate lot. Thus, while a 40,000 square foot lot that is zoned R-1 can only have one residence, on it, the same lot zoned R-S may have eight units. (The R-1 zoned lot can, however, be subdivided into 5,000 square foot lots, on each of which one residence can be built.) Through the D Combining District the density may be raised or lowered; the former to a maximum of one unit for each 1,500 square feet of lot area.

- The PD (Planned Development) District was originally used for major residential subdivisions, including condominiums. However, the County also uses this District for a variety of other applications where traditional zoning district requirements may not be appropriate. The PD District has no set standards; it is a free form district in which the ordinance creating the district sets the standards for its use and development. The density for a PD must conform to the General Plan. In order for a PD to be approved by the Board of Supervisors, the County must make the finding that the density is consistent with the applicable General Plan.

Table III-4 summarizes the various zoning classifications in the Unincorporated Areas of the County.

Combining Districts

The Zoning Ordinance also provides for Combining Districts. These districts are mostly used in connection with a residential district. Two of them, the –B District and the –D District, modify the site area and yard requirements of a standard district. For example, the basic R-1 building site area requirement is 5,000 square feet. With a –B District this can be changed to R-1-B-8 to require an 8,000 square foot minimum building site area; R-1-B-10 (10,000 square feet MBSA); R-1-B-20 (20,000 square feet MBSA); R-1-B-40 (40,000 square feet MBSA); or R-1-B-E, in which case the building site area is as specified in the ordinance, e.g. R-1-B-E (Single Family Residence, 5 acre MBSA).

The –D District is specifically used with the R-S District to set the density at one unit per each 3,500, 2,500, 2,000, or 1,500 square feet of lot area or as specified: R-S-D-35, R-S-D-25, R-S-D-20, R-S-D-15, or R-S-D-E, respectively.

The –DV (Density Variable) District is to be combined with the R-S districts in order to provide for variations in the intensity of development to act as incentive to combine narrow parcels into larger, more regular parcels associated with better site development. DV districts allow one dwelling unit per 2,000 square feet of lot area where average lot width is not less than 100 feet and the lot area is not less than 20,000 square feet; the density for lots not meeting these criteria shall be one dwelling per 3,500 square feet of lot area.

The –SU (Secondary Unit) Districts are combined with the R-1 or the R-S District to allow a secondary residential unit (also known as granny flats, in-law units, etc.) on the same lot as a single-family residence. The units may be attached or detached, and are generally limited to no more than 640 square feet.

Table III-4: Zoning Districts: Residential Development Requirements, 2014

District	Min. Building Site Area (MBSA) (Sq. Ft.)	Front yard setback (feet)	Rear yard setback (feet)	Side yard (feet)	Parking spaces per unit	Max. Height (feet)	Max. lot coverage
R-1	5,000+	20	20	5	2	25	No limit
R-2	2,500+	20	20	5	2	25	No limit
R-3	2,000+	20	20	5	2	25	No limit
R-4	1,250	20	20	10 - 30	2	45	40 %
R-S	1,500 (through the -D-15 combining district)	20	20	10	2	25	No limit
A	100 Acres	30	10	10	2	30	12,000 sq. feet for residential and residential accessory uses.
A-160	160 Acres	30	10	10	2	30	12,000 sq. feet for residential and residential accessory uses.
A-320	320 Acres	30	10	10	2	30	12,000 sq. feet for residential and residential accessory uses.
M-U	5,000+	20	20	5	2	35	No limit

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

Notes:

- Maximum densities do not take into consideration required setbacks, parking, walkways, driveways, and topographic features.
- Alternate provisions for rear yards are permitted in R-1 districts where there is compensating open space.
- Side yards in an R-1, R-2 or R-3 district shall not be less than five feet. One foot is added for each full ten feet the median lot width exceeds 50 feet, up to a maximum requirement of ten feet.
- Combining units may modify the MBSA for the residential district and thus change the density; secondary units are allowed under an overlay district in some R-1 Districts which would increase potential maximum densities in those areas.

- Under the PD District, the maximum density is determined by site conditions.
- Housing for agricultural caretakers and employees are permitted uses in an Agricultural district; however they are subject to Site Development Review.

Parking

Parking is a necessary aspect of any development and can constrain the development of affordable housing. For every parking space that is required, there is less land available for development. Excessive parking requirements can thus drive up the cost of development. Parking requirements in Alameda County, however, are similar to other jurisdictions and are not considered to be so stringent as to be a constraint to affordable development. The parking requirement for housing is the minimum required by some local jurisdictions. Under the County's subdivision ordinance, a single family home must have two onsite, parking places and one on-street-parking place. Because it is assumed that the prime times for commercial use and residential do not typically overlap, higher density housing in mixed-use areas can have a considerably lower parking requirement, which is determined on a case-by-case basis.

In an effort to provide some regulatory relief, the pending Illustrated Design Guidelines permit the use of tandem and compact parking spaces. In addition, the County's Density Bonus Ordinance permits a reduction in parking standards based upon the number of affordable housing units provided.

On-Site Open Space Requirements

The County imposes no on-site open space requirements, except for the R-S District, which usually applies to high-density development. In the R-S district, the 600 square feet of open space per unit requirement can normally be met within the standard setback requirements.

Setbacks

Setbacks are necessary to regulate health and safety. However, as setback requirements determine the buildable area on a lot, they may serve to constrain the number of housing units that can be achieved. A PD (Planned Development) district may be used when the site is unique, and in which case some flexibility is desirable to protect site amenities yet provide the allowable development potential to be realized. As a result, staff does not believe that required setbacks pose a major obstacle to development.

Height

The maximum height for all residential development is generally 25 feet, but parcels with R-4 zoning may be as tall as 45 feet, and may be as tall as 75 feet provided that the building does not cover over 30% of the lot. The Castro Valley Central Business District and Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plans also allow heights greater than 25 feet in certain locations.

Lot Coverage

The County has a lot coverage limit in the R-4 zone of 40%. The Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan and the Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plan permit up to 70% lot coverage. Agriculturally zoned parcels that are within the East County Area Plan are permitted 12,000 square feet for residential and residential accessory uses. Agricultural caretaker and employee housing is considered an agricultural use and therefore, is not counted in the 12,000 square foot limit. An FAR of .01 is allowed for agricultural and other non-residential uses.

Lot Size Requirements

Minimum lot sizes range from 5,000 square feet to 5 acres. For a multi-family project, the minimum lot size is 5,000 square feet. Minimum lot size requirements do not impose an unreasonable constraint to the production of affordable housing in relation to the size of vacant lots/parcels remaining for residential development. The minimum lot sizes permitted by the County are comparable to surrounding jurisdictions, and do not pose a significant constraint to housing development.

Unit Sizes

The County does not impose minimum dwelling unit sizes in its single-family or multi-family zones.

Density

The County's various zones permit densities of up to 50 dwelling units per acre before density bonuses. This is a sufficient range of densities to permit the construction of various types of housing affordable to all income levels. Densities within each zone are described in Tables III-1, III-2, and III-3.

Housing Type

A housing element must demonstrate the availability of sites, with appropriate zoning, that will encourage and facilitate a variety of housing types, including multi-family rental housing, manufactured housing, mobile homes, housing for agricultural employees, single room occupancy units, emergency shelters, transitional housing and supportive housing. While some of these housing types are not yet permitted by-right, others are. Table III-5 summarizes the various housing types permitted in each zoning district.

Table III-5: Housing Type Permitted by Zoning District and Specific Plan

	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-S	CVCBD ⁽¹⁾	CVCBD-S11 ⁽⁵⁾	A	FA ⁽²⁾	RC	TA	TC	M-H	M-U
Single-Family	P	P	P	P	P		P	P						
Two-Family		P	P	P	P		P							
Triplex			P	P	P		P							
Multi-family ⁽³⁾				P	P	P	C		C	P	P	P ⁽⁴⁾		
Mobile Home Park		C	C	C	C								P	
Manufactured Home	P	P	P	P	P		P	P						
Second Unit	P	P	P	P	P			P						
Small Residential Care and Group Homes (six or fewer persons)	P	P	P	P	P		P	P						
Large Residential Care, and Group Homes (seven or more persons)	C	C	C	C	C		C							
Transitional and Supportive Housing	P	P	P	P	P		P	P						
Emergency Shelter				P										
Agricultural Caretaker/Farmworker Housing								P						
Mixed Use						P			P	P	P	P		P
Single Room Occupancy				C										

P=Permitted; C=Conditionally Permitted

Source: Alameda County Zoning Ordinance, Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plan (ACBD), and Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan (CVCBD)

Notes:

- (1) High Density Residential (Multi-family) is described as at least 20 du/acre within the CVCBD Subareas 2, 4-10
- (2) "FA", Freeway Access; "RC", Residential Commercial, "TA", Transit Access; and "TC", Transit Corridor designations are found in the ACBD. Although they are not part of the County's Zoning Ordinance, they function as zoning districts within their designated portions of the ACBD.
- (3) Five or more units
- (4) Permitted as a secondary use
- (5) "CVCBD-S11" refers to Subarea 11 within the CVCBD. Although the various subareas that comprise the CVCBD are not a part of the Zoning Ordinance, they provide guidelines that impact the development of housing within the specific plan.

Single-Family: Single family residences are permitted in all residential “R” districts, and agricultural “A” districts.

Two-family Dwellings (Duplexes): Two-family dwellings are allowed in all residential districts except R-1.

Triplexes and Fourplexes: Developments with 3 or 4 dwelling units are permitted in R-3, R-4 and R-S districts.

Multi-family Dwellings: Multi-family dwellings are permitted in the R-4 and R-S districts. The ACBD Specific Plan permits multi-family dwellings in Residential Commercial (RC), Transit Access (TA) and Transit Corridor (TC) districts. They are conditionally permitted within FA (Freeway Access) districts. The CVCBD Specific Plan provides for multiple family dwellings in Subareas 2, 4-10; they are conditionally permitted in Subarea 11.

Mobile Home Parks: Mobile home parks are conditionally permitted in the R-2, R-3, R-4 and R-S districts and are subject to the regulations provided in Sections 17.52.1000 through 17.52.1065.

Manufactured Home: Any manufactured home (which includes mobile homes) that was constructed after June 15, 1976 and certified under the National Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Act and placed on a permanent foundation may be located in any residential area where a single family residence is allowed, and must be subjected to the same development restrictions.

Second Units: A second unit is defined as a unit that is attached or detached to an existing single family dwelling that is no more than 640 square feet. Second units are permitted in R-1 and R-S districts having one but no more than one existing dwelling unit on the parcel subject to the following requirements:

- Property must have at least 3 legal parking spaces independently accessible from the street, not located in front or street side yard, plus 1 parking space anywhere on the lot.
- The attached secondary unit shall have a direct external entry.
- A detached secondary unit shall be limited to one story, fifteen feet in height, a minimum of ten feet from the existing dwelling. The detached secondary unit shall be clearly subordinate to existing principal single-family dwelling by size, appearance and location and shall be located to the rear of the existing dwelling.
- The unit must conform to all other regulations of the zoning district.

Permit approval is subject to a planning staff level review of the site and building plans to ensure compliance with height, setbacks, maximum floor area, and parking requirements. The administrative plan check process can be completed over the counter provided that the proposed project meets the County’s development standards for second units.

Residential Care Facilities: Residential Care facilities are nursing and convalescent homes licensed by the Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division and the Department of Public Health. This term also includes group living quarters housing persons placed by an authorized agency for rehabilitation purposes and is funded by or licensed by or is operated under the auspices of an appropriate federal, state or county governmental agency. Residential care facilities with six or fewer person are allowed by right in all residential districts,

while those serving 7 or more residents are subject to discretionary approval.

Transitional and Supportive Housing: Per the County’s Zoning Ordinance, transitional and supportive housing facilities are permitted by right in all residential zones, and all commercial zones that allow residences. Consistent with Senate Bill 2 (Cedillo), the County only regulates those facilities which are licensed by the State. The County is currently seeking ways in which to improve the quality of unlicensed facilities to ensure that they provide safe, affordable housing to their residents.

Emergency Shelter: Emergency shelters are permitted within the R-4 district.

Agricultural Caretaker/Employee Housing: Under the County’s Zoning Ordinance agricultural caretaker dwellings are permitted in all A (Agricultural) Districts.

Mixed Use Developments: The mixed use zoning districts referenced in the Housing Element Sites Inventory are within the Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plan (ACBD), Transit Access (TA); Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan (CVCBDSP), Subarea 10; and the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan (SLVCSP). Table III-6 contains a summary of representative mixed use standards, as well as their guidelines for development. Tables III-5 and III-6 also contain pertinent information regarding mixed uses within Alameda County.

Table III-6: Mixed Use Zoning Guidelines by Specific Plan

Plan	Density	Development Guidelines
ACBD, Transit Access	50 du/ac (Page 3-29)	A “significant portion” must be for commercial use and no less than 50% of ground floor space (Page 3-28)
CVCBDSP, Subarea 10	Varies; subject to Site Development Review (Page 77-78)	Residential must be to the rear or above commercial (Page 66)
SLVCSP	19.66 (Page 30)	Permitted where part of a project that includes commercial development. (Page 30)

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Facility: The Zoning Ordinance defines SRO facilities as “a building containing six or more SRO units or guestrooms, designed for occupancy of no more than two persons, and which is intended, designed, or is used as a primary residence by guests.” Such facilities are conditionally permitted in the R-4 district.

Evaluation of Zoning Standards

The County adopted these development standards to ensure that minimum levels of design and construction quality are maintained, and that adequate levels of infrastructure improvements are provided. While these standards generally apply to all developments, standards can be modified using special development permits to accommodate projects that are unique or provide special housing arrangements. For example, the zoning ordinance permits density bonuses to lower income housing developments, and also permits the relaxation of standards related to parking, setbacks, lot size, and lot coverage (Chapter 17.106 of the Zoning Ordinance). Allowing flexibility within the County codes and ordinances is intended to reduce development costs. The County Zoning Ordinance also allows for the more efficient use of land by allowing

variances to typical size, height, and bulk requirements for conventional dwellings as a combination of different land uses that complement each other, contrary to existing zoning regulations.

Although the County codes and ordinances are flexible to allow for varying housing types and densities, the codes and ordinances can potentially act as a constraint on the construction of affordable housing, particularly on housing for very low- and low-income households. The County has proactively reduced the potentially constraining effects of its regulations through informal preferential processing for affordable housing projects. Pending design guidelines for multi-family and mixed-use projects will increase the number of permit decisions that can be made administratively, and provide greater flexibility to vary from the strict application of zoning standards. In addition, the County has restarted the process of updating its Zoning Code. One goal of the revised code will be to evaluate constraints to the development of housing.

Most of the County's design standards do not significantly constrain the provision of housing. Setback and subdivision requirements are not excessive and would not result in a reduction of units, and there are no lot coverage standards. After careful consideration of the Zoning Ordinance in its entirety, it appears that the height limit of 25 feet (the equivalent of a two-story limit) placed on multi-family housing presents a problem for high density, multi-family residences. To address this constraint, this Housing Element contains a goal to increase the height limit in transit-oriented development districts and higher density residential districts.

Proposed Zoning Code Update and the Alameda County Residential Standards and Guidelines
During the planning period, the County will pursue an update of its Zoning Code that will combine development standards, design quality standards, and sustainability standards. When adopted, the updated Zoning Code will better and more effectively facilitate residential infill development and multi-family housing development through these new standards and guidelines and the creation of several new mixed-use zones.

As an interim step, the County is developing design guidelines for residential development. These guidelines are intended to facilitate the development of various types of housing.

Growth Controls

In November 2000, the voters of Alameda County approved the Measure D Initiative that amends the Alameda County General Plan. The principle provisions of the Initiative as they pertain to the ability of the County to provide housing include the following:

- The East County Area Plan's (ECAP) Urban Growth Boundary was redrawn to remove North Livermore (and the 12,500 units in the planning stage) from urban development, and the County was directed to withdraw from the joint planning Settlement Agreement with the City of Livermore and North Livermore landowners. North Livermore west of Dagnino Road was redesignated as an Intensive Agriculture area with the potential for 20-acre enhanced agricultural parcels upon demonstration of available water (among other requirements).
- Lands designated for Urban Reserve in East County were redesignated as Large Parcel Agriculture.
- The South Livermore Valley Area Plan was amended to place absolute limits on density and geographical extent.

- Areas identified in the Initiative as Castro Valley and Palomares Canyonlands in the West County were redesignated as Resource Management (100 acre minimum parcel size).
- General Plan amendments, such as subdivision applications that increase allowed density, will now automatically necessitate a vote of the County electorate.
- Under the Initiative, the Board of Supervisors may modify the East County Urban Growth Boundary in order to meet State-imposed housing obligations, but only if criteria specified by the Initiative can be met.

Under the terms of Measure D, the portions of the County General Plan revised under the Initiative may not be amended except by voter approval, with the exception that the Board of Supervisors can impose more stringent restrictions on development and land use. Furthermore, existing and future County plans, zoning regulations, etc. must be consistent with the provisions of the ordinance. Portions of the ECAP and other planning documents that were not amended or enacted by the Initiative may still be modified without voter approval provided the modifications are consistent with the provisions of the Initiative.

Measure D has major implications for the development of housing within the County because it explicitly places limitations on the density and intensity of development outside of the Urban Growth Boundary. However there are several programs and policies contained within the ECAP/Measure D that mitigate the impact of the initiative on the provision of affordable housing. Also, the County has initiated several programs to support the development of affordable housing. Under Policy 23 of the plan, the County must provide economic incentives to developers of affordable housing. This policy is implemented through programs 7 through 11 which propose an incentive system that could include density bonuses, low-income housing fees, fee waivers, low income set asides, and joint development projects with non-profit housing developers. In addition, ECAP/Measure D requires each residential and non-residential project to contribute to meeting the housing needs of very low-, low- and moderate-income households. The County already has a density bonus program in place; the park dedication fee ordinance permits waivers of the fee for affordable housing projects; and the County has participated in development projects with several local and regional non-profit housing developers.

Housing for Persons with Disabilities

The Housing Element must demonstrate efforts to remove constraints or provide reasonable accommodations for housing designed for persons with disabilities. The section describes the County's efforts to remove barriers which prevent the creation of housing for persons with disabilities.

Lanterman Act

At present, there are no zoning, design review, or building code provisions that conflict with the goal of providing a barrier-free environment. Under the State Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Lanterman Act), small licensed residential care facilities for six or fewer persons must be treated as regular residential uses and permitted by right in all residential districts. A State-authorized or certified family care home, adult and senior care facility, foster home, or group home serving six or fewer persons with disabilities or dependent and neglected children on a 24-hours-a-day basis is considered a residential use that is permitted in all residential zones. Facilities for more than six persons are conditionally permitted

in most residential zones, as well. Alameda County has no siting or separation requirements for residential care facilities or group homes beyond those required by the State.

Building Codes

The County's building codes also require that new residential construction comply with Title 24 accessibility standards. These standards include requirements for a minimum percentage of fully accessible units in new multi-family developments, as well as requirements for accessible parking and common spaces. The provision of fully accessible units may also increase the overall project development costs. However, enforcement of accessibility requirements is not at the discretion of the County, but is mandated under State law.

Reasonable Accommodation

Under State and Federal laws, local governments are required to provide "reasonable accommodation" to persons with disabilities when exercising planning and zoning powers. According to the Federal Departments of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Justice (DOJ) a "reasonable accommodation" is a change, exception, or adjustment to a rule, policy, practice, or service that may be necessary for a person with a disability to have an equal opportunity to use and enjoy a dwelling.⁵ In 2006, the County established a Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance. There is currently no established process in place and reasonable accommodations are granted on a case-by-case basis. As part of its Housing Programs, the County will draft reasonable accommodation procedures.

County Assistance

Alameda County also provides assistance via its Accessibility Grants and Rehabilitation Loan programs. Funds provided through these programs may be used to make the dwelling accessible to a person with limited mobility. Both structural and nonstructural modifications for accessibility are permitted. These programs increase the availability of accessible housing stock throughout the unincorporated areas.

Definition of a Family

The Alameda County Zoning Ordinance does not define the term "family", and as such has no occupancy standards for related or unrelated adults.⁶

Transitional and Supportive Housing

Transitional and supportive housing includes an array of on-site services to help residents gain the independent living skills necessary to transition to permanent housing. Transitional housing provides for stays for up to two years depending upon the individuals' needs.

Under Senate Bill 2 (Cedillo), local jurisdictions must identify sites for supportive transitional and

⁵ Joint Statement of the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Justice: Reasonable Accommodations Under the Fair Housing Act, May 14, 2004.

⁶ California court cases (City of Santa Barbara v. Adamson, 1980 and City of Chula Vista v. Pagard, 1981, etc.) have ruled an ordinance as invalid if it defines a "family" as (a) an individual; (b) two or more persons related by blood, marriage, or adoption; or (c) a group of not more than a specific number of unrelated persons as a single housekeeping unit. These cases have explained that defining a family in a manner that distinguishes between blood-related and non-blood related individuals does not serve any legitimate or useful objective or purpose recognized under the zoning and land use planning powers of a municipality, and therefore violates rights of privacy under the California Constitution.

permanent housing and subject them to the same permitting procedures as other housing within the zone without any undue special regulatory requirements.

The County does not regulate living arrangements that do not require licensure from the State. Moreover, the County does not distinguish or regulate occupancy any differently than for other households. Therefore, transitional and supportive housing facilities are permitted by right in all residential zones, and all commercial zones that allow residences.

Residents of various facility types, both licensed and unlicensed, and members of the wider community have expressed concerns regarding the quality of care and availability of housing options. As a result, the County has pulled together a cross-functional team of staff to discuss how housing can be improved for all of our vulnerable populations. We are looking at models within and outside of California to develop a model that protects residents and promotes ongoing quality improvement.

Support for a Variety of Housing Types

Employee Housing

The Employee Housing Act requires local governments to treat employee housing providing accommodations for six or fewer employees the same way as a single-family unit with a residential land use designation. The County cannot require a conditional use permit or other permit that is not required of a family dwelling of the same type in the same zone, and use of a family dwelling for the purposes of employee housing for six or fewer occupants shall not constitute a change of occupancy. Alameda County complies with these requirements of State law.

Senior Housing

The County encourages the development of rental housing for moderate- and lower-income seniors by offering a density bonus program consistent with the State Density Bonus Law. The County recently granted entitlements for an 85 unit rental housing project for low income seniors.

Farmworker Housing

Housing for farmworkers is a permitted use in all Agricultural (A) Districts. However, creation and occupancy of these dwellings are subject to a site development review.

Manufactured Housing

Manufactured housing is a type of housing that is generally constructed in a factory and is later transported to a site for use. According to HUD, manufactured housing is a dwelling built entirely in a protected environment as prescribed by Federal law. The term "mobile home" describes factory-built homes produced prior to the revisions to Federal housing law in 1976.

Manufactured homes meeting the State Uniform Housing Code and installed on a permanent foundation are considered regular single-family homes and are permitted where single-family homes are permitted. With the exception of design requirements, a jurisdiction can only subject the manufactured home and the lot on which it is placed to the same development standards which are required for a conventional single-family residential dwelling.

Emergency Shelters

According to Government Code Section 65583(a)(4), every locality must identify a zone or zones where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without a conditional use or other discretionary permit. In accordance with these requirements, the County has amended its Zoning Ordinance to allow emergency shelters to locate by right in the R-4 residential zone.

Emergency shelters must comply with specified development standards. The standards for emergency shelters are the minimum necessary to ensure the health and safety of the occupants and reasonable transportation access to and from the facility. The zoning districts in which emergency shelters may be located provide adequate opportunities to locate such facilities on vacant sites or through the conversion or redevelopment of existing land uses.

Emergency Shelters are subject to the following regulations and development standards:

- A. An Emergency Shelter shall obtain and maintain in good standing all required licenses, permits, and approvals from County and State agencies or departments. An Emergency Shelter shall comply with all County and State health and safety requirements for food, medical, and other supportive services provided on-site;
- B. No Emergency Shelter facility shall have more than sixty (60) beds;
- C. Each resident shall be provided a minimum of fifty (50) gross square feet of personal living space, not including space for common areas;
- D. Bathing facilities shall be provided in quantity and location as required in the California Plumbing Code (Title 24 Part 5), as amended, and shall comply with the accessibility requirements of the California Building Code (Title 24 Part 2), as amended;
- E. No individual or family shall reside in an Emergency Shelter for more than 180 consecutive days;
- F. The operation of buses or vans to transport residents to or from off-site activities shall not generate vehicular traffic substantially greater than that normally generated by residential activities in the surrounding area, to the satisfaction of the Planning Director;
- G. The on-street parking demand generated by the facility due to visitors shall not be substantially greater than that normally generated by the surrounding residential activities, to the satisfaction of the Planning Director;
- H. Arrangements for delivery of goods shall be made within the hours that are compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability of the surrounding properties;
- I. The facility's program shall not generate noise at levels that will adversely affect the livability of the surrounding properties, and shall at all times maintain compliance with the County Noise Ordinance;
- J. Onsite management shall be provided twenty-four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days per week. All facilities must provide a management plan to the satisfaction of the Planning Director that shall contain policies, maintenance plans, intake procedures, tenant rules, and security procedures;
- K. The facility is no closer than three hundred (300) feet from other emergency shelters unless findings can be made that such an additional facility would not have a negative impact upon residential activities in the surrounding area;
- L. On-site parking shall be provided in accordance with Section 17.52.910;
- M. The facilities shall provide exterior lighting in the parking lot, on building exteriors, and pedestrian accesses. All exterior lighting shall be down-cast and shall not illuminate above the horizontal. No light source shall be exposed above the horizontal, nor visible from neighboring residential use properties.
- N. Required yards shall conform with the R-4 zoning district yard requirements; and

O. A waiting and client intake area of not less than one hundred (100) square feet shall be provided inside the main building.

The Alameda County Continuum of Care has chosen to prioritize permanent housing rather than emergency shelters for homeless persons. In any event, the emergency shelter beds for 173 persons identified through the Homeless Count could be accommodated within the current R-4 district zoning. There are twelve parcels within R-4 districts, comprising 6.68 acres, which are listed on the County's Site Inventory that may be used for this purpose.

Secondary Units

Assembly Bill 1866 requires that localities amend their Zoning Ordinance to permit secondary units in all residentially zoned areas. The government may specify minimum requirements for secondary units, but excessively prohibit their development. As a part of the County's Housing Plan, the County will review its Secondary Units policy to ensure consistency with State law.

Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Units

Definitions and performance standards for SRO units were added to the Alameda County Zoning Ordinance in 2012.

SRO units are conditionally permitted in the R-4 zone. The Zoning Code provides development standards relating to common facilities, facility size, security, manager's office, parking, and development plan review. The County's zoning standards provide considerable flexibility to developers in constructing SRO units which are often an affordable housing alternative for low-wage workers. There is no indication these standards pose a constraint.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is a state law that requires state and local government to consider the potential environmental effects of a project before a decision is made. Under CEQA, a project is an activity undertaken by a public agency or a private activity which must receive some discretionary approval (meaning that the agency has the authority to deny the requested permit or approval) from a government agency which may cause either a direct physical change in the environment or a reasonably foreseeable indirect change in the environment. CEQA's purpose is to disclose the potential impacts of a project, suggest methods to minimize those impacts, and discuss project alternatives so that decision-makers will have full information upon which to base their decision. CEQA also provides for review of environmental documents by government agencies and the public in order to provide a thorough and transparent environmental review process. Most proposals for physical development in California are subject to the provisions of CEQA, as are many governmental decisions which do not immediately result in physical development (such as adoption of a general or community plan). Every development project which requires a discretionary governmental approval will require at least some environmental review pursuant to CEQA, unless an exemption applies.

Fees and Exactions

Development Impact Fees

Alameda County and other public agencies charge a number of planning, building, and engineering fees to cover the cost of processing development requests, and providing public facilities and services to new development. Payment of these fees can have an impact on the cost of housing, particularly affordable housing. Fees are limited by state law, which requires

that “a public agency may not charge applicants a fee that exceeds the amount reasonably necessary” to provide basic permit processing services.⁷

Development impact fees (DIFs) are based upon the impact of new construction on services provided by the jurisdiction. Where development occurs on raw, previously undeveloped land, the cost of providing services is considerably higher than when infrastructure and other services are already in place as is the case where new development occurs as infill. According to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (State HCD), fees on new homes can be as high as 15% of the total housing production cost. Many of the development impact fees are attributable to the inability of local jurisdictions to pay for the cost of services as a result of Proposition 13 that places limits on property taxes and thus the ability of the jurisdiction to provide services.⁸

Within urban unincorporated areas of Alameda County, the fee load for a 2,500 square foot single family residence where development is permitted by right ranges from \$57,621 - \$75,110. This variation is due to differences in development costs within the unincorporated areas. This amount amortized at 4.5%, adds \$292- \$380 per month to the mortgage payment, or as much as \$136,800 over 30 years of loan payments.

As the example above illustrates, fees vary according to location within the unincorporated area. For the purpose of estimating development fees, this study estimated fees for Castro Valley and for the combined areas of San Lorenzo, Ashland and Cherryland. Fees in Castro Valley are higher for both single family and multi-family housing. At present, assuming a 2,500 square foot home with a 400 square foot garage and 200 square foot deck, the Castro Valley fee would be \$75,060 per single family unit and in San Lorenzo, Ashland and Cherryland, the fee would be \$57,571 per single family unit. For multi-family units, assuming units that are 900 square feet within a 40-unit property, fees would be \$42,062 per unit in Castro Valley and \$32,148 per unit in the other three areas. The major differences between Castro Valley and the other three areas are higher fees charged by EBMUD and CVSan for water and sewer connections, respectively.

Table III-7 describes the range of fees a developer may encounter when constructing new housing within the Unincorporated Alameda County.

⁷ California Government Code Section 65943 (c)

⁸ Raising the Roof- California Housing Development Projections and Constraints 1997-2020, Chapter 7, State Department of Housing and Community Development

Table III-7: Impact Fees for Single Family(1) and Multi-family(2) Housing in the Unincorporated Area as of February 2014

Fee Name	Castro Valley		Ashland, Cherryland, San Lorenzo	
	Single Family	Multi-family	Single Family	Multi-family
Impact Fees (Per Unit)				
EBMUD Water Service				
Connection, Capacity & Account Fees	\$32,951	\$13,716	\$21,851	\$10,206
Sanitary Districts				
Sewer Connection and Inspection Fees	\$13,224 ⁽⁵⁾	\$12,966	\$6,835	\$6,562
County Planning Department				
Park Dedication Fees ⁽⁸⁾⁽⁹⁾	\$11,550	\$10,200	\$11,550	\$10,200
School Districts				
Residential Impact Fees	\$7,425	\$2,406	\$7,425	\$2,406
Public Works				
Building Permit Fee	\$4,860	\$879	\$4,860	\$879
Plan Check Fee	\$2,363	\$427	\$2,363	\$427
Cumulative Traffic Impact Mitigation Fee	\$2,227	\$1,332	\$2,227	\$1,332
Flood Control Review Fee	\$69	\$19	\$69	\$19
Stormwater Surcharge ⁽³⁾	\$117	\$109	\$117	\$109
Roadway Encroachment Fee ⁽⁴⁾	\$324	\$8	\$324	\$8
Total Fees Per Unit	\$75,110	\$42,062	\$57,621	\$32,148

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

Notes:

- (1) Based on a prototype of a detached 2,500 SF home with a 400 SF garage and a 200 SF deck.
- (2) Based on a prototype of a 40-unit multi-family development consisting of units averaging 900 sq. ft. each.
- (3) This fee varies based upon the number of improvements required.
- (4) Per-unit fee for multi-family projects varies substantially with the number of units in the development.
- (5) Does not include, or assume annexation fees.
- (6) Does not assume that a grading permit, or additional engineering is required as a result of being in a flood zone or the Alquist-Priolo Act.
- (7) Stormwater permits may be required.
- (8) A developer may pay the Park Dedication Fee or dedicate land to be used for parks or open space.
- (9) Park dedication requirements may be waived for affordable housing developments.

Although development impact and planning fees are a significant portion of the overall housing costs, Alameda County's fees are consistent and in some cases lower than those charged by neighboring jurisdictions, with the possible exception of Site Development Review. Table III-8 lists costs for nearby municipalities.

Table III-8: Fee Comparison

Locality	Site Development Review	Variance	Rezone
Fremont	\$4,000 deposit/ At Cost ⁽¹⁾	\$1,200 Deposit/ At Cost	\$1,000-12,000 ⁽²⁾ Deposit/ At Cost
Hayward	\$4,000-15,000	\$7,000 Deposit/ At Cost	\$15,000 Deposit/ At Cost
San Leandro	\$1,613 or \$1,880 ⁽³⁾	At Cost	At Cost
Dublin	Time and Materials/ At Cost	Time and Materials/ At Cost	\$10,000 Deposit/ At Cost
Alameda County	\$4,000 Deposit/ At Cost	\$1,500 Deposit/ At Cost	\$4,000 Deposit/ At Cost
Livermore	\$16,520	\$7,240	\$11,730 or \$14,960

Source: Various Planning Departments, retrieved February 2014

Notes:

- (1) Can include Building Permit, Site Plan and Architectural Review
- (2) The jurisdiction has more than one application types that fall within the category of rezoning.
- (3) For major residential projects or major projects with protected views.

Planning staff concludes that while development impact fees certainly constrain the provision of affordable housing, the County’s fee structure cannot entirely be considered a constraint to the development of housing. Although the County is required to collect school fees, it does not have the authority to amend them as they are established by the State. Fees related to the installation of water and sewer service are controlled by the applicable water or sewer purveyor.

The County generally does not waive fees for affordable housing as these fees are intended to provide for public facilities necessary to support the new development. However, in order to facilitate the development of new affordable housing, one option is to distinguish fee rates between conventional housing and affordable/senior housing developments, as the park dedication ordinance currently allows. The provision of necessary infrastructure and public facilities is necessary for the development of quality housing in a suitable living environment. In the case of affordable housing developments, the County may use HOME CDBG funds or other funding mechanisms to help offset the cost of development within the unincorporated areas. In addition, the County will review its park dedication fee structure so that it is consistent with current land prices, and to ensure that it does not pose an undue constraint to affordable housing development.

On-Site and Off-Site Development Fees

The County may require a project sponsor to incur the expense of either on-site or off-site development fees. On-site improvements pertain to private improvements required within the boundaries of the subject parcel. These include open space, parking, landscaping and lighting requirements. In addition to the fees associated with these improvements, the developer may need to cede some developable area in order to make these improvements. The Subdivision Map Act and the County’s Title 16 (Subdivisions) address these requirements.

The size, location and number of dwelling units proposed all have an impact upon the number of improvements necessary for a subdivision's approval. For example, urban infill parcels may have existing systems and improvements that are deemed adequate to support the additional housing units. In these cases, the costs of on-site and off-site improvements do not serve as a constraint on housing production. However, in less urban/rural areas there may be several improvements required as a condition of approval. The need for infrastructure to support housing in these areas adds to the overall cost to develop housing. These are typical for such development within the region and are not considered a heavy constraint on development.

Below is a summary of the improvements and their related guidelines that are often associated with large subdivisions (five or more parcels).

Street Right-of-Way Width Requirements: The minimum right-of-way widths of streets which are to be accepted into the County road system is 40 feet. Easements for construction and maintenance of slopes in excavation or embankments outside the limits of street dedication may be required where topographical conditions make easements desirable. Grades of all streets and alleys shall be established so that the subdivision is properly drained and shall conform as nearly as possible to the natural topography of the property. Where a subdivision adjoins acreage, provision may be made for reasonable future access to the acreage. The widths of streets shall be based on the width of streets of which they are a continuation

Curbs and Gutters and Sidewalk: Developers are generally required to construct curbs, gutters and sidewalks as needed to meet the existing street pavement and to support the new subdivision.

Public Safety and Fire Protection: Developers may be asked to construct the following items as they may be necessary for public safety, including but not limited to: local neighborhood drainage, traffic safety signs and devices, and street lighting.

In case of a subdivision included in a fire district the developer shall install water mains, fire hydrants, gated connections and appurtenances to provide water supply for fire protection to the subdivision.

Water and Sewer Connections: For all subdivisions having lots less than forty thousand (40,000) square feet, a sanitary sewer system and sewage disposal works serving each lot administered by a public agency authorized to levy taxes for such purposes, which agency has consented in writing to provide such service. Septic systems may be appropriate where the lot size and intensity of uses are consistent with their use.

Circulation Improvements: Developers may be asked to provide on-site improvements or to dedicate land as needed for access and circulation within the development.

Off-site improvements, while directly related to the proposed project's impacts, relate to the County's infrastructure and therefore are for the public's benefit. There are various types of off-site improvements a developer may encounter, Tri-Valley Transportation Development Fee (assessed exclusively in the East County), traffic mitigation fees, school district fees, water and sewer connection fees, and park in-lieu fees. Due to the County's broad geographic scope, these fees may vary depending on the location of the project.

Park Services: The Planning Department enforces the Park Dedication Ordinance adopted by the Board of Supervisors in June 1992. A park in-lieu fee is assessed to new construction projects. Under the Park Dedication Ordinance, prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for construction of all new residential units, a dedication of land or payment of fees in lieu of dedication of land. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that new development pays its fair share of provision of park and recreation facilities in the Unincorporated Area. As described herein, the ordinance takes into consideration the jurisdiction's need for affordable and senior housing by exempting such developments from the fee.

Planning Fees

While most planning entitlement fees are one-time fees, some entitlements, such as Plan Amendments, require an initial deposit upon application submittal. Supplemental deposits are required when the actual cost of processing the application exceeds the amount of the initial deposit. As the application fees for certain types of entitlements can vary, applicants may not be able to estimate the actual application cost prior to filing. The Planning Director is authorized to reduce or waive fees for affordable housing projects, and has done so in the past. Table III-9 presents common application fees related to planning entitlements.

Processing and Permit Procedures

Similar to other jurisdictions, the County has a number of procedures it requires developers to follow for processing entitlements and building permits. Although the permit approval process must conform to the Permit Streamlining Act, housing proposed in the county is subject to one or more of the following review processes: environmental review, zoning, subdivision review, use permit control, design review, and building permit approval.

The time and financial cost of land investments during the development permit process can contribute significantly to housing costs. Generally, the time required for processing a typical development varies depending on the size and complexity, as well as the location of the project. The County has developed forms to help residents and developers navigate through the process. In April 2007, the County completed the construction of its Building Permit Center to streamline the process of obtaining development permits. At the Building Permit Center an applicant can obtain information and feedback on plans from planners, plan checkers, fire department staff and engineers. The center also has several handouts available that describe the requirements for various types of developments and land uses.

Table III-9: Alameda County Planning Entitlement Application Fees, 2014

APPLICATION TYPE		FEES, DEPOSIT ⁱ
REZONING	Standard or Planned Development	AT-COST/\$4,000 deposit
	Determination for Modification of Planned Development	AT COST/\$1,500 deposit plus \$1,500 for CUP ⁱⁱ
SUBDIVISION *	New Tentative Tract/Parcel Map	AT-COST/\$4,000 deposit
	Re-filing of Tentative Map	AT-COST/\$4,000 deposit
	Parcel Map Over 40 acres	AT-COST/\$4,000 deposit
SITE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW	Standard	AT-COST/\$4,000 deposit
	Agricultural/Principal Unit	AT-COST/\$1,000 deposit
	Agricultural/Caretaker Unit	AT-COST/\$750 deposit \$300 FEE for renewals
	Minor SDR	AT-COST/\$1,500 deposit
	Modify Conditions	AT-COST/\$1,500 deposit
	Garage Conversions	AT-COST/\$500 deposit
	Sign Review	\$300
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT WORK (CEQA)	Initial Study	Included in Fee or Cost
	CEQA Exemption	Included in Fee or Cost
	Environmental Impact Report	Included in Fee or Cost
	Other, e.g., Review as Responsible Agency	AT-COST
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT	Standard	AT-COST/\$1,500 deposit
VARIANCE		AT-COST/\$1,500 deposit
GENERAL PLAN	Amendment	AT-COST/deposit to be determined
SPECIFIC PLAN	Initiation or Amendment	AT-COST/deposit to be determined
APPEALS	Fixed Fee Applications	\$250
	At-Cost Applications, appeal by Applicant	AT-COST ⁱⁱⁱ
	At-Cost Applications, appeal by other than Applicant	\$250 ^{iv}
PRE- APPLICATION MEETING	CUP and Variance	\$125
	Others	\$150 ^v

Notes:

- i. Please note that the deposits cited above are based on the typical time it takes to process an application of that type. However, processing time can vary depending on the specifics of an application and it is possible, particularly if an application becomes controversial, that the processing time, and thus the cost, may exceed the original estimate. If this happens, the applicant is responsible for the additional costs. When costs approach the amount of a deposit, staff will notify the applicant and request an additional deposit based on staff's best estimate of the additional time necessary to complete the application review. The County will bill charges for staff time spent processing an application at an hourly rate that represents staff salary plus overhead and will bill consultant charges at actual cost. In addition, the County will bill direct costs, including but not limited to actual costs of mailing or publication of notices or actions, against the deposit. Depending on the particulars of the specific application, an applicant may be asked to submit a larger or smaller deposit at the pre-application or intake meeting. Where the application is not noted as AT-COST the amount stated is a fixed fee regardless of the time spent on the application.
- ii. If expected to be a minor modification.
- iii. Charged against deposit
- iv. No further charges against applicant where applicant is not the appellant
- v. Plus \$150 for each additional agency, e.g., Public Works, Fire, etc., that attends the meeting

Permit and Entitlement Process for Typical Residential Projects

In most cases, the construction of a single-family residence is subject only to the issuance of a building permit provided the zoning and parcel lots are in place. However, within certain zones an applicant will have to attain additional entitlements such as a Site Development Review or Conditional Use Permit. If environmental constraints exist, the developer may incur additional review expenses. Multi-family projects that result in five or more units are subject only to a site development review prior to the issuance of building permits if the zoning is in place.

Project applications are initially reviewed through a "Pre-application Meeting" which can identify potential problems early in the development process. Staff gives priority and special handling to affordable housing projects to meet funding deadlines. The goal is to help move applicants from project concept to building occupation smoothly while meeting the County's regulatory responsibilities. There are three components to a Pre-application Meeting:

- Initial review to identify any potential problems
- Review of possible conditions of approval
- Troubleshooting when needed

Although no study has been conducted to precisely determine the costs and time saved by an applicant, the general consensus is that the meetings are useful and are a positive benefit.

If an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required, the processing time is increased. In sharp contrast, for cases in which the development is permitted "by-right," such as multi-unit dwellings in R-S, R-3 and R-4 zones, the processing time is markedly less as no discretionary review is required; only site plan approval is required. The processing time for site plan reviews is approximately three to six months, as measured from the date of a complete application.

Alameda County Land Use Advisory Groups

In addition to the Alameda County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, the review process for discretionary projects in the unincorporated areas is governed by several advisory and decision-making bodies:

- Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council
- Sunol Citizens Advisory Committee
- Parks, Recreation and Historical Commission
- Airport Land Use Commission
- Boards of Zoning Adjustments

The purpose of these bodies is to facilitate and invite direct citizen participation in the planning process. These groups provide a forum for the review of proposed amendments to plans, zoning matters and use permits. The County tries to reduce delays in processing by scheduling any advisory meetings concurrently with staff review of applications.

Special Permit Processes and Procedures

Density Bonus Ordinance: Alameda County provides additional incentives for the production of affordable housing for lower-income and senior households through density bonus provisions on the Zoning Code (Chapter 17.106 of the Code). These incentives seek to address the cost and other impacts of the County's development regulations on the production of affordable housing. Under the County's density bonus program, an applicant proposing to construct a specified percentage of affordable housing can receive approval for additional dwelling units beyond the number otherwise allowed by the Code. The County will also consider additional incentives that can help reduce the cost of building affordable housing, such as reduced parking requirements or flexibility in other development standards.

State law (California Government Code, section 655915) was amended in 2004 and 2005 to require a "sliding scale" of density bonuses based on the percentage and targeted income level of affordable housing units. The number and types of additional incentives that cities and counties were required to offer was also expanded. In 2012, Alameda County updated its density bonus provisions to comply with current State law.

As demonstrated in the County's land use inventory (Chapter IV), multi-family and commercially zoned sites have the greatest potential to accommodate housing affordable to very low- and low-income households. This is particularly true if financial subsidies are provided to a developer and/or affordable housing is included as part of a large, master planned development with a range of housing types and costs. Although the County has sufficient land zoned to accommodate housing affordable to lower income households, Planning Department staff remains diligent to ensure that the application of specific zoning requirements does not affect the feasibility of producing affordable housing.

Variations: Variations can be granted for special circumstances that are unique to a property. These special circumstances may include size, shape, topography, location, surroundings, or the location of heritage or landmark trees where the strict application of zoning requirements would deprive a property of privileges enjoyed by other properties in the vicinity and under identical zone classifications. Variations help mitigate potential constraints that could result from the strict application of County zoning standards.

Conditional Use Permits: Conditional use permits (CUP's) are required to insure the proper integration of uses that may be suitable only in certain locations or zoning districts because of their special nature and/or potential for becoming nuisances. They may also only be suitable when such uses can be controlled or designed in a particular manner. Details regarding permitted and conditional residential uses for each zone are provided in Table III-5. The County uses the conditional use permit process to establish building standards and reasonable use conditions, not to regulate the users or occupants.

Potential concerns addressed by the use permit include factors such as noise, dust, dirt, litter, fumes, odors, vibrations, and traffic congestion. Conditional uses are those that need special review to determine their compatibility with the surrounding area and to establish special conditions to maintain harmony with the neighborhood.

Overview of Alameda County Land Use Review Processes

The County has five types of review processes for residential development projects. They are described below and illustrated in the diagram that follows.

Process 1: All construction permits, including building permits, are processed ministerially.⁹ Approvals granted must comply with zoning regulation and General Plan regulations. Such projects involve a staff-level decision.

Process 2: Discretionary actions that may apply to residential development include parcel maps (4 or fewer parcels) and site development reviews. A site development review is required when residential development is proposed on agriculturally zoned parcels. Some planned developments may require a site development review. Large multi-family developments are required to obtain a site development review. Site development reviews are heard by the Planning Director.


Process 3: Discretionary actions that could apply to residential development include certain conditional use permits and variances. Conditional use permits are required when development is proposed that is not allowed by right in certain zones. Such projects require the approval of the Board of Zoning Adjustments

Process 4: Discretionary actions that could apply to residential development include tract maps (5 or more parcels) and agricultural subdivisions. Such projects require the approval of the Planning Commission.

Process 5: Discretionary actions such as rezoning or general plan amendments. Such projects require a Planning Commission recommendation and the approval of the Alameda County Board of Supervisors.

⁹ From Section 15369 of the CEQA Guidelines, "Ministerial" describes a governmental decision involving little or no personal judgment by the public official as to the wisdom or manner of carrying out the project. The public official merely applies the law to the facts as presented but uses no special discretion or judgment in reaching a decision. A ministerial decision involves only the use of fixed standards or objective measurements, and the public official cannot use personal, subjective judgment in deciding whether or how the project should be carried out. Common examples of ministerial permits include automobile registrations, dog licenses, and marriage licenses. A building permit is ministerial if the ordinance requiring the permit limits the public official to determining whether the zoning allows the structure to be built in the requested location, the structure would meet the strength requirements in the Uniform Building Code, and the applicant has paid his fee."

Figure III-1: Alameda County Land Use Review Processes



Detailed Description of a Typical Review Process

Depending on the project and where it is located, several of these groups may review a project. The general procedures described as follows apply to the following types of applications: General Plan Amendments, Tentative Tract Map, Tentative Parcel Map, Conditional Use Permits (CUP), Rezoning, Site Development Review, and Variances.

1. Applicants generally start the permitting process by obtaining general zoning and application information at the Building Permit Center. At this time the planner will typically identify which ordinances and regulations could potentially affect the proposed project. The planner will also inform the applicant of which development approvals are necessary for the project to proceed. To assist applicants who are interested in filing a subdivision application, the County established an interdepartmental "Pre-application meeting". Furthermore, applicants are required to contact the Planning Department for this counseling before beginning the subdivision application process. Depending on the nature of the proposed project, additional materials for the application may be required.
2. Applicants make an appointment to submit the completed application and documentation package to the Planning Department. A planner reviews the materials to ensure completeness. All projects subject to a discretionary review require an initial study/environmental assessment in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.
3. Within 30 days the applicant will receive notice as to whether or not the project requires additional information or is complete.
4. Once the application has been deemed complete, it will be referred to various parties for comments. These generally include, Alameda County Public Works, the applicable fire department, and water provider.
5. A planner will complete a staff report outlining the history of the parcel and the proposed project.
6. The Planning Director or appropriate board or commission will conduct a public hearing upon completion of the above requirements. The department sends the applicant and other interested parties (i.e. neighbors and/or persons/groups that request notification) legal notification of the public hearing.
7. A decision is made on the project, and the applicant is notified of the results. There is a ten day window to appeal the decision of the Planning Director or a board. Appeals may be heard by either the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors.

The time it takes to review and approve a residential development proposal can increase the cost of construction due to inflation and the developer's carrying costs during this period. The County has considered the length of time it takes to process several different types of applications, from General Plan amendments to Conditional Use Permits. Table III-10 provides an estimated time for completion for types of requests received by the Planning Department. The County must comply with procedural requirements set forth in state law for environmental review, subdivision review and planning actions, including General Plan amendments, and rezoning. State law establishes hearing requirements, review periods, public notification, and time limits for various actions with which local governments must comply. The requirements are not only mandatory, but must be completed in a specific order. The complexity of each

individual project can influence processing time as staff may take more time to review projects requiring environmental documentation.

Table III-10: Estimated Alameda County Planning Department Processing Times

Application	Estimated Time for Completion
General Plan Amendment- Board of Supervisors	12-18 months
Rezone- Board of Supervisors	12-18 months
Tentative Subdivision Map- Planning Commission	3-6 months
Conditional Use Permit- Board of Zoning Adjustments	3-6 months
Variance- Board of Zoning Adjustments	3-6 months
Site Development Review- Staff Level Review	3-6 months
Boundary Line Adjustment- Staff Level Review	1-3 months

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

Currently a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), Site Development Review (SDR), or Variance would take 3-6 months to complete. Rezoning and General Plan Amendments require the approval from the Board of Supervisors and the Planning Commission, and may take 12-18 months for a final decision. Tentative Tract Map and Parcel Maps require the approval of the Planning Commission, and may take 3-6 months for approval. Projects that occur in Castro Valley must be heard before the Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council in addition to any other required hearing body. As always projects that meet significant public resistance take longer to finalize than others. Larger subdivisions (20 or more units) may take up to a year to finalize.

To minimize disruptions in the project review process, staff works with the applicant to achieve a completed application that conforms to the various procedural, design, and zoning requirements. Processing times vary depending on the size and complexity of the project, the completeness of the application, and the conformance of the project to the Zoning Code requirements. This process takes place via the Pre-application meeting which occurs prior to the formal submittal of an application and review period begins. Factors that could alter the review and approval time for a project include:

- Volume of applications;
- Number of general inquires (phone, front counter, correspondence);
- Extent and detail of code requirements;
- Timelines for public notice (state law and Zoning Code);
- Time and extent of noticing desired by some members of the community;
- Concurrent special projects;
- Subjective review issues (building and site design);
- Level of community involvement and interest; and
- Preparation time for agenda item staff report and the number of agencies/departments that have regulatory authority or input.

The County makes every effort to review applications in an efficient and timely manner. The aforementioned requirements and process meet, but do not exceed, those required under State law and therefore do not impede project approval in comparison to other jurisdictions.

Building Codes

Uniform codes regulate new construction and rehabilitation of dwellings. These codes include building, plumbing, electrical, mechanical, and fire codes. The codes establish minimum standards and specifications for structural soundness, safety, and occupancy. Alameda County enforces the 2013 edition of the California Building, Plumbing, Mechanical, Electrical, and Fire Codes. The County last updated Title 15, the Building Ordinance, effective January 1, 2014, adopting by reference the above codes and defining the County's administrative processes and specific County provisions for construction. The building codes enforced by Alameda County are typical of those enforced throughout the state. The County's Grading Ordinance was last updated in 2010 and may be considered typical of California jurisdictions.

The Alameda County Development Services Department of the Public Works Agency is responsible for enforcement of the codes. Code compliance is conducted through a series of scheduled inspections during the course of construction to ensure compliance with the health and safety standards. Inspections are also conducted in response to public complaints or an inspector's observations that construction is occurring or has occurred without proper permits. Code enforcement is limited to correcting violations that are brought to the County's attention. Proactive code enforcement is limited due to scarce resources. Violation correction typically results in code compliance without adverse effects upon the availability or affordability of the housing units involved.

The County's building codes do not place constraints on housing beyond those mandated by state law, and are the minimum necessary to protect public health and safety. Therefore, no changes are necessary.

Historic Preservation

In 2012, The Board of Supervisors adopted a historic Preservation Ordinance for unincorporated Alameda County. The Ordinance codifies:

- How the Alameda County Register of Historic Resources is defined and maintained;
- How properties can be added to the Register;
- How properties can be removed from the Register;
- Which alterations to historic properties are subject to review;
- Which incentives may apply to historic properties;

Proposed demolitions of structures that are 50 years old or more, are evaluated for potential impacts to historic resources. Historic resources are defined under the Ordinance as "any object, building, structure, site, area, place, or record which is historically or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of Alameda County." The cost of this review is \$125.00 and generally takes 1-2 weeks. This review process has been in place for nearly four years, and is comparable to the reviews undertaken in other jurisdictions. To date, no housing development has been denied because of this Ordinance. As a result, the County does not believe that this poses an undue constraint on the development of housing.

Article 34

Article 34 of the California Constitution requires local jurisdictions to obtain voter approval before they develop, construct, or acquire publicly subsidized housing that is affordable to lower-income families. Although not all affordable housing development that is supported by a local jurisdiction falls under the legal definition of "develop, construct, or acquire" subsidized

housing, this requirement is a significant constraint to the development and preservation of affordable housing because it requires local jurisdictions to continually return to the voters for permission to develop housing that is critically needed in the jurisdiction or to restrict fewer units to affordable levels than might otherwise be provided. Local jurisdictions typically place a measure or referendum on the local ballot that seeks authority to develop a certain number of units during a given period of time.

Alameda County has not held an Article 34 election, since it does not directly build affordable housing. Although the County provides loans and grants to affordable housing developers, this does not trigger Article 34 unless the County restricts more than 49% of the units within a single project. The County policy is to restrict 49% or less of each project funded. As a result, a lack of Article 34 authorization has not been a barrier in the production of affordable housing.

Septic Systems

Septic use is typical in the rural areas of Eastern Alameda County. The County utilizes a permitting procedure for the design of new septic systems that requires review of engineering plans. Alameda County Department of Environmental Health (ACEH), Land Use Program coordinates with the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFRWQCB) to permit Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTS's), also known as septic systems, for sewage disposal and to ensure safe, potable water on new and existing development projects in Unincorporated areas of Alameda County. The planning and permitting process, as well as schedule and cost for regulatory oversight on projects with an OWTS will differ depending on the type of system and complexity of the project, and where the project is located as well as the regulatory agencies involved.

There are two types of septic systems – standard and alternative – available to address a range of site-specific factors. Both types of septic systems are subject to the County's permitting process for wastewater treatment and disposal. Standard septic system design is based on accepted design principles that are assumed to ensure proper functioning of the system for extended periods. Older septic systems within the County are typically standard septic systems. Alternative septic systems may be necessary when site conditions do not lend themselves to installation of a standard type of system. Examples of alternative systems include advanced, high flow, and high strength systems. None of the parcels identified in the Sites Inventory (Appendix A) require the use or installation of septic systems, as each parcel may access sewer/wastewater services from a local sanitary district.

The permitting process and associated fees, shown in Table III-11, may constitute a governmental constraint to development. In addition, development setbacks necessitated by OWTS's may limit the amount of land available for residential development.

Table III-11: ACEH Land Use Program Fee Schedule

OWTS Project Phase	Fee Amount
Application Processing Fee	\$145.00
Consultation Meeting	\$145.00
Site Visit/Evaluation	\$433.00
Existing OWTS - Performance/Site Evaluation	\$433.00
Existing OWTS - As-Built Plan Review	\$433.00
OWTS Preliminary Design Review	\$1,587.00
OWTS Final Design Review	\$433.00
Standard OWTS Construction Permit	\$866.00
Advanced OWTS Construction Permit	\$1,011.00
OWTS Abandonment Permit	\$433.00
OWTS Operating Permit	\$288.00
OWTS Operating Permit Renewal	\$288.00
Potable Water Supply Well Source Testing	\$433.00
Deed Restriction	\$145.00

Source: Alameda County Environmental Health, Land Use Program,
http://www.acgov.org/aceh/landuse/program_fees.htm

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SAFETY CONSTRAINTS

In the County's unincorporated urbanized areas (e.g. Castro Valley), most of the remaining undeveloped parcels are infill parcels that have one or more physical constraints, such as slope, drainage, or traffic circulation. Housing projects on these infill parcels must be evaluated under the environmental review process mandated by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), which may result in reducing the amount of land available for housing in order to protect sensitive environmental and visual resources, avoid geologic hazards, and reduce land use incompatibilities with neighboring residents. While at times constraints to more affordable housing, these mitigations are required under State law for the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The following sections describe the environmental and infrastructure constraints to the development of housing.

Hillsides and Slopes

Hillsides exist in both urbanized and rural parts of the County, ranging from slopes of 10-20% to very steep parcels where there are slopes in excess of 30%. Development on such terrain necessitates severe grading and land modifications, which significantly add to the cost of development. A parcel's topography is always a major consideration in the review of development applications. Development restrictions are specifically described in the Madison Avenue and Fairview Specific plans. Within these plans building is restricted to areas where the slope does not exceed 30%. In addition these parcels are generally larger and are zoned to accommodate single family residences. Moreover, the County's Building Code has additional requirements for houses built on steep hillside slopes to mitigate potential earthquake hazards.

Creeks and Watercourses

The presence of rivers, streams, and other water bodies (many of which are subject to regulation by the state and federal governments) may affect the intensity and costs of residential

development. Alameda County is pursuing the revision of the County's Watercourse Protection Ordinance to provide clear standards for the development of parcels that contain or are adjacent to watercourses.

Fire Hazards

Many parts of the County are susceptible to fires because of hilly terrain, dry weather conditions, and the nature of the plant cover. The intensity of development, the size of the potentially affected population, and the difficulties of containment result in high and extreme fire risks in many of the unincorporated areas. To reduce the risk, new developments are required to comply with Fire Department requirements for setbacks, driveways and fire suppression. The fire department charges developers fees to review development plans and to perform inspections of the property prior to the receipt of a Certificate of Occupancy.

In addition to the fire services provided by the Alameda County Fire Department, the Fairview Fire Protection District also serves a portion of the unincorporated area. The Fairview Fire Protection District (the "District") is an independent special fire district in Alameda County; organized under the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code. The District's goal is to provide fire protection service to its residents. Such services include fire prevention through code enforcement and education, as well as fire suppression. The District also provides emergency medical services at the Advanced Life Support (Paramedic) level.

The District has contracted with the City of Hayward since 1993 to provide fire protection and emergency medical services within the boundaries of the District. Under the contract, the City of Hayward also takes care of weed abatement complaints within the District.

Flooding and Mudflows

To determine the risk of flooding, and thereby reduce flood damage, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps flood plains and prepares studies to identify areas of likely flooding based on existing and planned development and existing flood control facilities. Areas with a 1 percent (1 in 100) chance, or more, of flooding in any one year are in a 100-year flood plain. In other words, the area is expected to flood at least once in a 100-year period. These 100-year flood plains are mapped as Special Flood Hazard Areas.

The County in conjunction with other local jurisdictions participates in the FEMA sponsored National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The NFIP provides flood insurance to businesses and individuals in known flood hazard areas. As a participant, the County must comply with FEMA's standards for the regulation of development in special flood hazard areas and conduct floodplain management activities not only to reduce or prevent the loss of life or property, but also preserve and protect the floodplain.

Within the Alameda County Public Works Agency, the Flood Control and Water Conservation District works specifically to protect county citizens from flooding. The Flood Control District:

- plans, designs and inspects construction of flood control projects,
- maintains flood control infrastructure,
- assists in planning new developments to preserve the integrity of the flood control system, and,
- preserves the natural environment through public outreach and enforcement of pollution control regulations governing our waterways

The Alameda County Ordinance Code addresses flood hazard mitigation in the following documents:

- The Watercourse Protection Ordinance (Chapter 13.12)
- Section 15.08.230 of the Building Ordinance
- Grading Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Chapter 15.36)
- Floodplain Management (Chapter 15.40)

New development within a floodplain is generally required to be at least one foot above the 100-year flood levels, or may be restricted completely within any designated floodway (i.e. the central portion of certain 100 year flows).

These documents are periodically reviewed and updated to ensure consistency with State law and/or NFIP requirements.

Seismic Hazards

Within Alameda County, there are many active and potentially active fault segments, and an undetermined number of buried faults, which are potentially capable of producing damaging earthquakes.

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act's main purpose is to limit the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The Act only addresses the hazard of surface fault rupture and is not directed toward other earthquake hazards. The Seismic Hazards Mapping Act, (SHMA) passed in 1990, addresses non-surface fault rupture earthquake hazards, including liquefaction and seismically induced landslides.

The SHMA requires the State Division of Mines and Geology (DMG) to prepare new Seismic Hazard Zone Maps showing areas where liquefaction or earthquake-induced landslides have historically occurred or where there is a high potential for such occurrences. The purpose of the maps is to help reduce and, where feasible, mitigate earthquake hazards in new construction. The County is required to use the maps in the regulatory process to mitigate the potential danger and high costs of such events. Larger residential developments within seismic hazard zones require a special geotechnical review before project approval. Construction is not prohibited in these areas, but stricter standards may be requested as part of the geotechnical review and approval process.

Section 15.08.240 of the Alameda County Building Ordinance requires applicants for new construction to submit soils or geologic reports for sites affected by a number of seismic and geologic hazards. In addition, new structures are required to incorporate design elements to reduce building failures. The Grading, Erosion and Sediment Control Ordinance (Alameda County General Ordinance Code, Chapter 15.36) establishes standards for grading, construction and the control of erosion and sediments. In addition, Section 15.36.110 of the County Grading Ordinance gives the Director of Public Works the authority to require a soils and geologic investigation in support of any proposed development on private property. Chapter 16, the Subdivision Ordinance, contains various provisions relating to the investigation of seismic and geologic hazards, and the design and construction of improvements relating to the subdivision of property.

Airport Influence Areas

The Airport Land Use Influence areas are established to ensure compatibility between uses surrounding the County's airports. Within these areas, certain land use decisions are subject to review by the Airport Land Use Committee (ALUC). In Airport Influence Areas, all new developments and change of use applications, whether or not they are within cities or in the unincorporated areas, are subject to ALUC review. There are 3 airports that may influence land use decisions in the unincorporated areas. They are the Hayward Executive Airport, Livermore Municipal Airport, and Oakland International Airport. Airport Influence Areas span between 2 to 3 miles from an airport and are defined by flight patterns and type and size of airports. Requirements for ALUC review may increase case processing time.

National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Requirements

Urban stormwater runoff has been identified as one of the most serious sources of pollutants reaching the San Francisco Bay. The United States Environmental Protection Agency requires municipalities with storm drainage systems to apply for a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit to discharge stormwater.

The NPDES permit requires reduction of the discharge of pollutants in stormwater and prohibits the discharge of non-stormwater into storm drains. In particular, the permit requires that stormwater quality control measures be implemented as part of development projects. The requirements of the NPDES stormwater permit are implemented by County Agencies with the coordinating assistance of the unincorporated area Clean Water Program located in the Public Works Agency (PWA).

Eastern Alameda County Conservation Strategy (EACCS)

The purpose of the EACCS is to preserve endangered species by developing a shared vision for long term habitat protection. EACCS was developed in part to ensure that development in the County meets regulatory requirements imposed by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The EACCS assesses areas all across East Alameda County for their conservation value and establishes guiding biological principles for conducting conservation in the county. In support of its purpose, EACCS:

- Provides a blueprint for regional conservation of biological species in East Alameda County.
- Streamlines the environmental permitting process; thereby reducing project delays and costs.
- Provides guidance to project proponents by focusing mitigation efforts on focal species due to future development and infrastructure improvements.
- Facilitates ongoing conservation programs by providing a coordinated approach supported by local stakeholders and regulatory agencies.

EACCS covers rural lands that are within the boundaries of ECAP, and as such will not have a great impact on the development of housing within the urban areas of unincorporated Alameda County.

INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRAINTS

Adequate infrastructure and public services are necessary to accommodate future residential development. Existing and projected deficiencies in infrastructure and public services in

Alameda County are primarily a result of growth and development pressures, although increased consumption by existing customers is also a factor. The following sections discuss the availability of water, sewer, street, education, and park services to accommodate new development in the unincorporated areas.

Water Supply

In Alameda County, the primary sources of potable water are surface water resources. Rural areas where surface water is in short supply or where surface water delivery systems are absent rely on groundwater resources.

There are two primary public water providers for unincorporated Alameda County. They are the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) and the Zone 7 Water Agency (Zone 7). Zone 7 supplies treated drinking water to retailers serving nearly 200,000 people in Pleasanton, Livermore, Dublin and, through special agreement with the Dublin San Ramon Services District, to the Dougherty Valley area. They also supply agricultural water to 3,500 acres, primarily South Livermore Valley vineyards, and provide flood protection to all of eastern Alameda County. EBMUD generally supplies water to the western, urban unincorporated areas of the County. Those areas without water service are generally more rural and agricultural in nature and are served by on-site water resources. In general, the limited availability of public water confines more dense residential development to those areas having potable water service. In addition, the adequacy of the overall water supply is an ongoing concern. Increased demand for water may result in higher impact fees associated with development of vacant land.

The majority of the sites identified in the County's Sites Inventory (Appendix A) are served by the East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD). EBMUD has water rights for up to 325 million gallons per day from the Mokelumne River, which is the source of 90% of EBMUD's water supply.¹⁰ Existing facilities include 21 reservoirs and water tanks that provide water to the areas identified in the Sites Inventory. EBMUD summarizes its water services capacity in its Water Supply Management Program 2040. According to the plan, EBMUD anticipates higher densities of existing land uses through 2040, consistent with the analyses from the State Department of Finance and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). The plan mentions implementation of water conservation and recycled water programs to decrease impacts of development. Although EBMUD may need to replace some facilities during the upcoming years, the District has determined that it can meet customer service demands (based on ABAG population projections) through the year 2040 during normal year conditions. This would include the projected Regional Housing Needs Allocation (1,769 housing units) that the County is required to plan for. EBMUD's Mokelumne River supply is sufficient during normal or wet years to accommodate current demand, but falls short during droughts. The Water Supply Management Program 2040 Plan states that during severe droughts EBMUD may be unable to meet the need for water without imposing extreme rationing measures in excess. When a drought occurs, EBMUD may impose customer rationing of up to 15%.¹¹ In the case of multiple dry years, in addition to water consumption reduction programs, the District's water supply would have to be supplemented.

¹⁰ EBMUD, Water Supply Management Program 2040, <https://www.ebmud.com/sites/default/files/pdfs/wsm-2040-revised-final-plan.pdf>

¹¹ Ibid.

EBMUD has been engaged in several projects to secure the future water supplies and to ensure water availability following a major earthquake. Projects included exploring underground alternatives and desalinization opportunities, and ongoing conservation and recycling efforts.

The availability of water to support residential development will depend on the supplies ultimately sought by the water providers in the county, and state and federal regulatory constraints on those supplies. The availability of water supply is influenced by the availability of infrastructure to deliver water. Water providers in the county are currently engaged in an infrastructure planning process to ensure that an adequate supply of water is available throughout their service areas. Depending on the timing and funds available for those infrastructure improvements, however, water supply could pose a constraint to the development of housing.

On January 17, 2014, Governor Brown declared a state of emergency due to drought conditions. Although no limitation has been imposed upon housing development, the long term impact of the state's water crisis is unknown. Nonetheless the availability of water is an ongoing concern that may impact housing development.

Sewer/ Wastewater Services

There are five providers of wastewater treatment services for the unincorporated areas, as well as the cities. For those parcels not linked to public sewers, there are on-site septic systems to treat wastewater. The lack of public wastewater treatment facilities can be considered an impediment to housing development, but cannot really be addressed in a cost-effective manner.

Public wastewater services are provided to the parcels identified in the Sites Inventory by two Sanitary Districts: Oro Loma (OLSD) and Castro Valley (CVSan). The OLSD treats flows within the boundaries of the Eden Area as well as from the CVSan service area. The service area of the CVSan and OLSD includes virtually all lands within the voter approved Urban Growth Boundary. The only developed areas that continue to rely upon privately owned septic systems are off of Crow Canyon Road beyond Coldwater Drive, off of Cull Canyon Road, in the Palomares Canyon area, and some portions of Fairview.

For sewer service, the developer must construct all lines within the subdivision and pay a trunk connection fee to the local sanitation district per dwelling unit. Fees vary within the County based on the location of the development, the specific sewer district that is to serve the development and the type of development (single- or multi-family). If the development is located in an area of the county where annexation to the sanitary district becomes necessary, an additional annexation fee is required.

In general, the capacities of sewer facilities are considered adequate to serve the land uses for which the Castro Valley and Eden areas are currently zoned and planned. Mitigation measures, such as replacing under-sized sewer pipes, may be required for individual projects depending on the number of units and square footage.¹²

Streets

In urban residential neighborhoods, new development can overburden aging infrastructure that

¹² An analysis of sewer capacity is included within the adopted EIRs for the Castro Valley and Eden Area Plans. In both cases, sewer capacity was considered sufficient for current and future needs.

is not meant to handle the additional demands that higher density developments can generate. In urban expansion areas, developers may need to build new streets to ensure adequate access to the residential developments and/or implement traffic engineering measures to mitigate project impacts to an acceptable level.

Education

Increases in the number of families with school-aged children may create significant overcrowding in public schools. There are several public schools, especially elementary schools that are currently operating in excess of or near their capacity, necessitating the construction of new classroom facilities to mitigate additional school overcrowding. The ongoing budget crisis means that schools have fewer funds available to address the need to either improve or expand school facilities. School fees are established by State legislation and beyond the control of local governments.

Parks

The County has established a developer fee program for park facilities. This program establishes a fee structure to mitigate the impact of residential developments on park facilities in the unincorporated areas served by the Hayward Area Recreational District (HARD) and the East Bay Regional Parks District (EBRPD) Developers are required to pay the mitigation fee prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Park Dedication Fees range from \$10,200 per unit in multi-family construction to \$11,550 for detached single family residences. In 2002, Alameda County established a Park Fee waiver for regulated/restricted affordable housing projects, and senior housing projects (whether market rate or affordable).

NONGOVERNMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

The production, availability, and cost of housing in Unincorporated Alameda County can be negatively impacted by nongovernmental constraints. These constraints can impact the maintenance, improvement, or development of housing for all income levels. Nongovernmental constraints include state and local housing markets, the availability of financing, the price of land, and the cost of construction. Potential additional nongovernmental constraints on the development of new housing could include neighborhood sentiment and housing discrimination. This section of the Housing Element will briefly discuss the current credit markets and the national economic outlook expected impact on overall housing development during this planning period, however most of the issues addressed will focus on nongovernmental constraints that the County may be able to positively impact.

Housing Markets

In the past fifteen years, banks and lending institutions had significantly changed underwriting criteria, which allowed unprecedented numbers of borrowers to take on debt to purchase housing. Nationwide, the percentage of homeownership fluctuated between 64.2 and 69.2% from 1995-2013, with the high of 69.2% occurring in the 4th quarter of 2004.¹³ This was primarily achieved because of extraordinarily low interest rates and availability of capital. This investment into housing had positive impacts on the number of new housing units built.

¹³ U.S. Census Bureau News, Residential Vacancies and Homeownership in the Fourth Quarter 2013

As the market slowed towards the end of 2006, and homes did not sell in record times, prices were reduced to entice buyers. Overall, values began to fall due to the number of homes on the market. Many homeowners were faced with mortgages that were higher than their homes values. If a household had suffered an economic set back (loss of a job), and could no longer afford the mortgage, selling the home was no longer an option, and foreclosure became a reality.

As more homes were foreclosure upon, the values of home prices dropped exponentially, with some areas impacted more severely than others. The foreclosure crisis that began in late 2007 was further complicated by a recession in 2007-2009. Although economic indicators have improved slightly, credit markets remain an obstacle to housing development. The sections that follow address how these markets and other events have impacted lending to individuals, market-rate and affordable housing developers.

Mortgage Lending to Homebuyers

The availability of financing may sometimes constrain the development or conservation of housing. While home mortgage credit has been readily available at attractive rates throughout the U.S. since the early 2000s, due to the Recession, the credit market has tightened significantly. Borrowing costs are still quite low, but the terms and conditions required for financing has restricted the pool of eligible borrowers to those who are able to meet standard underwriting criteria.

The Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) requires lending institutions to disclose information on the disposition of loan applications by the income, gender, and race of applicants. According to the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council (FFIEC) 2012 HMDA data, a total of 9,721 households applied for government-backed loans in Alameda County in 2012. Not accounting for those applications which were either withdrawn (1,051), not accepted (605), or closed for incompleteness (167), a total of 6,429, or 81.4%, were approved and 1,469 applicants were denied. In regards to conventional loans, a total of 27,330 households applied for financing in 2012. Not accounting for those which were withdrawn (2,510), not accepted (1,799), or closed for incompleteness (675), a total of 19,199, or 85.9%, were approved and 3,147, or 14.1%, were denied.

The cost of borrowing money to buy a home is another factor affecting the cost of housing and overall housing affordability. The higher the interest rate and other financing costs charged for borrowing money to purchase a home, the lower the mortgage amount a household can qualify for. The mortgage amount that a household with income at the 2014 median level for Alameda County (\$88,500) can afford declines as the interest rate increases. Higher interest rates in the mortgage market also increase the amount of public subsidy required to provide affordable homeownership opportunities to median- income households.

For example, using a ratio of 28% of a household's monthly gross income as a reasonable amount to qualify for a loan, principal and interest monthly payment of \$2,065 would support a \$407,500 mortgage at 4.5% interest. (Additional costs such as taxes, insurance, utilities will increase the ratio to approximately 38%, a standard commonly used by lenders.) At an interest rate of 10% and the same monthly payment, a household would only be able to afford a mortgage of \$235,300. Table III-11 provides an example of the impact of financing on housing cost.

Table III-12: Impact of Interest Rate on Mortgage Amounts

Interest Rates	Monthly Payment	Qualifying Mortgage Amount	Down payment 10% of mortgage	Total Purchase Price
3%	\$2,065	\$489,700	\$48,970	\$538,670
4%	\$2,065	\$432,600	\$43,260	\$475,860
5%	\$2,065	\$384,500	\$38,450	\$422,950
6%	\$2,065	\$344,400	\$34,440	\$378,840
7%	\$2,065	\$310,300	\$31,030	\$341,330
8%	\$2,065	\$281,400	\$28,140	\$309,540
9%	\$2,065	\$256,500	\$25,650	\$282,150
10%	\$2,065	\$235,300	\$23,530	\$258,830

Sources: Alameda County Planning Department, February 2014

Since the beginning of the Recession, interest rates have been at all time low levels. Nevertheless, purchase prices have been extremely high, and many households have had difficulty purchasing homes. To assist in lowering the cost of homeownership for moderate-income households, Alameda County administers a first-time homebuyer program called the Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC) Program. The MCC Program offers first-time homebuyers a credit against their federal income taxes equal to 15% of the mortgage interest paid each year. This credit is available through the life of the loan, and can save borrowers thousands of dollars on their taxes each year, which in effect increases their net income available to purchase a home and pay other necessary expenses.

Financial assistance at the state level is provided by the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA), which offers a “first mortgage” program for properties located in federally designated targeted areas and is designed for low- and moderate income homebuyers. CalHFA also administers their own downpayment assistance program that provides a deferred-payment junior loan of an amount up to the lesser of three percent (3%) of the purchase price or appraised value to assist with down payment and/or closing costs.

The Foreclosure Crisis

The growing use of alternative mortgage products has allowed more individuals to qualify for home loans—many of these were lower income minority residents as described in a previous section. Loans with low initial payments often had provisions for substantial payment increases after several years (usually between 1 and 3 years). These loan products enticed many investors into the single-family market in the region. The increasing availability of these loan products also allowed homebuilders to qualify many more households for home purchase and provided more business opportunities for virtually every profession linked to the homebuilding and residential real estate markets (mortgage brokers, real estate agents, title companies, etc.).

Rapidly rising housing prices since the late 1990s provided homebuyers and investors a sense of security that, even if loan payments adjusted upward significantly after an initial period, the growth in home equity would allow the borrower to either refinance or re-sell the home and thus avoid financial difficulties. The ability to “grow” one’s way out of potential financial trouble with equity growth changed dramatically after 2005, when home prices began to level off and then decline in many parts of the region (both for new and existing homes). Many borrowers who purchased homes before 2005, particularly those with subprime loans, found that they owed more on their homes than their homes were worth. The changing mortgage market also affected borrowers without subprime loans in more expensive housing markets in California. In these more expensive markets (including parts of the Bay Area), borrowers have to qualify for “jumbo” loans—relatively large loans that are not federally backed. Individuals who previously

could qualify to purchase high-priced homes with jumbo loans have found it increasingly difficult to find willing lenders.

The confluence of flattening or declining home prices and the growing number of subprime and alternative loans resulted in a spike in notices of default on home loans beginning in 2007. A notice of default is the first step in the foreclosure process. The rate of defaults eventually slowed down as troubled subprime and alternative mortgages are resolved either through refinancing, the sale of homes with troubled mortgaged (often by backs), or foreclosures. In January 2014, Notice of Defaults increased 57.05% as compared to January 2013, while Notices of Sale, typically the last opportunity someone has to retain their property, have decreased 43.79%.¹⁴ This data indicates that there are still many homeowners in distress.

Neighborhoods are impacted by the existence of a large number of foreclosed homes. Foreclosed homes remain vacant for long periods which results in yards and structures that are not maintained. These properties become eyesores and lower a neighborhood's property values.

To assist homeowners who are on the verge of defaulting on their mortgages, the Alameda County Community Development Agency, Housing and Community Development Department (County HCD) supports local HUD approved counseling agencies which provides default/foreclosure counseling to homeowners.

Affordability

A significant change in nongovernmental constraints in this planning period is housing affordability. The cost of housing in the Bay Area has remained exceptionally high despite the recent economic downturn and high rates of home foreclosures. As of December 2013, the median home price in Alameda County is \$489,500, an increase over 27.1% of the previous year.²⁰

On a quarterly basis, Wells Fargo Home Mortgage and the National Association of Homebuilders (<http://www.nahb.org/>) publishes the National Housing Opportunity Index (HOI). The Index for a given area is defined as the share of homes sold in that area that would have been affordable to a family earning the local median income based on standard mortgage underwriting criteria. The HOI comes from public records, and may not represent all transactions in a given metropolitan area.

Fourth quarter 2013 HOI data of homes that sold and were published in the public records show that the median home price in Oakland/Hayward/ Fremont PMSA was \$450,000. Based on fourth quarter data, the Oakland/Hayward/Fremont area ranks seventeenth in affordability of the 28 metropolitan statistical areas in the state of California. Only thirty-eight percent of the houses sold during this quarter were affordable to households at median income.

Real Estate Financing For New Development

Another nongovernmental constraint to residential development is the difficulty of obtaining the real estate financing necessary to develop housing in older areas of the Unincorporated county that have not experienced significant previous reinvestment. Institutional lenders and outside

¹⁴ Data retrieved from propertyradar.com, www.propertyradar.com/trends/california/alameda

²⁰ Data retrieved from DQ News, <http://www.dqnews.com/Articles/2014/News/California/Bay-Area/RRBay140213.aspx>

investors have been cautious in providing financial backing for large scale developments. Developers attracted to projects in these areas are often smaller entities with limited records of achievement or with limited financial resources to invest, compounding the difficulties involved in obtaining development financing. In addition, financing in these areas may be perceived as more risky and therefore only offered at higher interest rates.

While problems still exist, there have been significant improvements in the availability of real estate financing in the past few years. County support for projects has been an important factor. County funds including loans at below-market interest rates (provided through local, state and federal programs) have provided the basis for partnerships with private lenders, adding both financial support and enhanced credibility to projects. Market factors and conditions, including high demand for Bay Area housing, a lack of alternative development opportunities, and rapidly escalating housing prices and rents in nearby areas have resulted in increased activity in Unincorporated neighborhoods that had previously had little new development in recent years.

Financing for Affordable Housing

In today's market, debt capital has been difficult to obtain for all types of residential development. It is often less accessible for affordable housing developments due to the difficulty in structuring complicated projects and the layering of needed financing. Low Income Housing Tax Credits have increasingly become a critical source of capital for affordable housing developments; however, competition for credits has become increasingly fierce due to diminishing State and federal funding sources. Typical sources of funding for affordable housing include:

- A first mortgage from a lending institution
- Low Income Housing Tax Credits and/or tax exempt mortgage bonds
- Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
- HOME Investment Partnership funds (HOME)
- State of California Proposition 1C funds
- California Housing Finance Agency loans

Depending on the type of financing used (e.g., tax credits, bonds, Federal funds), other requirements, such as the inclusion of certain accessibility accommodations and the use of prevailing wage can affect development costs significantly. The costs per unit for a recently entitled affordable housing project in Alameda County cost \$465,132 per unit.

In order to gain access to debt capital from conventional lenders, affordable housing developers are usually required to obtain supplemental funds from grants or secondary financing. Supplemental funds such as equity funds, predevelopment capital, performance guarantees, and bridge loans are used to fill the financing gap in making a project affordable. In the County, affordable housing developers often have difficulty in obtaining the supplemental financing needed to build affordable housing. As a funding source, the County is currently limited to its federal entitlement funding (CDBG and HOME). In recent years, the County's CDBG and HOME allocations have continued to decline due to dwindling federal support for these programs. Entitlement funding is made available to affordable housing developers through the County's semi-annual Notice of Funding Availability.

Supplemental funding (equity funds, predevelopment capital, bridge loans, etc.) is also potentially available through non-profit organizations and other government agency programs.

However, these regional, statewide, or national funding sources are often limited in scope and highly competitive. Although local affordable housing developers have done well in competing for these funds, they are not always reliable sources of funding.

The Community Reinvestment Act (CRA), passed by Congress in 1977, encourages financial institutions to help meet their communities' needs through sound lending practices and by providing retail banking and community development services in lower income neighborhoods. Thus, commercial banks, in their desire to fulfill CRA requirements, can be a valuable source of capital for affordable housing. The federal government provides additional funds for both interim/transitional and more permanent housing facilities, supportive services, and prevention programs for the homeless. Other program funding sources are highlighted in the chapter entitled *Housing Plan*.

Spurred by CRA requirements, experienced nonprofit developers have been active in the Unincorporated County, bringing credibility and experience in obtaining financing for affordable housing projects. Mixed-use projects can have difficulties, often based on uncertainties about the commercial component or the complexities of the project.

In addition, California recently eliminated Redevelopment agencies. Redevelopment agencies were required to set aside 20% of their tax increment revenue for the provision of affordable housing. Funds from this source were also critical in leveraging private equity and other government funds. The loss of this source of funding for the creation of affordable homes is substantial, but the full consequences of how this will affect the affordable housing market are still unknown. Those set aside funds were one of the only local sources of funding for affordable housing. As a result of these circumstances, it is not uncommon to find new affordable housing developments with six or more sources of financing in order to make projects financially feasible. This adds to the overall costs of development, since it can take a significant amount of time to receive funding approval from so many sources.

Currently, the County is working to develop a source of local funding for affordable housing developments and overall remains optimistic of the fate of affordable housing production in the County.

Development Costs

The cost of development includes multiple factors, including the cost of land, construction, permits and fees as well as developer overhead and expected profit.

Land Availability

The cost of land is impacted first by what is available. There are adequate sites for developing housing to meet Alameda County's housing needs, as described in Chapter 3, Sites Inventory and Capacity Analysis. However, while there is sufficient land available, development can be constrained by the need to assemble smaller parcels into larger development sites and/or by landowners seeking high prices for their properties. To facilitate site availability, the Economic and Civic Development/Redevelopment Successor Agency is playing a role in purchasing and assembling development sites and then soliciting developers for building new housing and/or mixed use developments.

Cost of Land

The cost of land varies considerably between and within jurisdictions. Market factors, especially the desirability of the location, play an important role in setting property values. Many infill lots

are 7,500 square feet, i.e. larger than the minimum size lot of 5,000 square feet but too small to subdivide. Information from the Multiple Listing Service in June 2014 indicates the cost of a vacant buildable lot for a single-family unit ranged from \$30,000 to \$1,100,000 or more. The cost of land suitable for multi-family development or subdivision for multiple single-family homes also varies. Recent affordable developments in the County that are subsidized by the County's Housing and Community Development Department have faced land costs that ranged between \$1.4 million to \$2 million per acre.

Construction Costs

The costs of constructing housing in the Bay Area are typically higher than other areas of the State. Construction costs are typically broken down by either a per unit cost or per square foot cost. Further, construction costs can be separated into "hard" or "soft" costs. Hard costs include items such as labor, building materials and installed components. Soft costs include items such as architectural and engineering, planning approvals and permits, taxes and insurance, financing and carrying costs, and marketing costs. The hard construction costs typically represent about 50 to 60 percent of total development costs. Thus, they have a significant effect on development feasibility. Land and soft costs can represent another 40 to 50 percent of the total cost of building housing.

Escalating land prices, construction costs (which includes both material and labor costs), and a high demand for housing have been major contributors to the increasing cost of housing in the Bay Area. The cost of construction varies with the type of new housing (single family vs. multi-family) and how it is built (wood frame, steel frame, and reinforced concrete). According to the Association of Bay Area Governments, wood frame construction at 20-30 units per acre is generally the most cost efficient method of residential development. However, local circumstances of land costs and availability and market demand will impact the economic feasibility of the various construction types. According to RS Means, a provider of construction cost estimation data, depending on the type of construction used, typical construction costs for multi-family residential construction within the area vary between \$150 - \$225 per square foot. If a parking structure or underground parking is needed, the cost per square foot will be greater. In addition, the cost to clear land for redevelopment may significantly increase the cost of the project. Depending on the existing improvements that must be removed or public infrastructure added to redevelop a site, the total cost to acquire a parcel, and possibly mitigate hazardous materials can be quite expensive.

Total Development Costs

All of these factors – cost of construction, cost of land, cost of labor – jointly contribute to the overall cost of housing in the Bay Area, including the Unincorporated Areas of the County.

Single Family Homes

As shown in the following table, the average estimated cost to develop a standard quality, 2,500 square foot, 2 story single family detached home with two and a half baths, an attached two car garage, and deck on a parcel located in the Unincorporated County is \$694,289. This assumes a land cost of \$150,000 the cost of construction at \$125.00 per square foot, plus additional fees, permits, and financing costs related to the project. Under this market rate infill scenario, land is approximately 22% of total cost, construction of the building is around 56%, total soft costs are about 22% with permits and fees around 8%. These figures may vary within the County because Castro Valley's fees are about 24% higher than those of San Lorenzo, Ashland, and Cherryland. This is largely due to the higher costs of water service to Castro Valley. Fees for water service are generally higher in the rural areas of the County than in the urban areas.

Table III-13: Single Family Development Costs, Unincorporated Alameda County, 2014

Item	Cost	Percentage
Land Cost	\$150,000	22%
Soft Costs		
Permits & Fees	\$57,621	8%
Other Soft Costs	\$100,000	14%
Construction Costs @ \$125/sq. ft.	\$386,668	56%
Total Development Costs	\$694,289	100%

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

Multi-family Housing

Multi-family housing costs are shown using a per unit cost scenario. In multi-family buildings, units are generally smaller (850 sq. feet for a two bedroom unit, 1,100 sq. feet for a three bedroom unit). In addition, there are economies of scale that do not exist in single family lot development. For instance, the cost of architecture on a per unit basis is significantly less when building 40 units as compared to just one unit. In addition, per unit land cost is generally much lower. In the chart below, the average cost to develop one unit in a 40 unit building is \$266,908, which is less than half of the cost of developing a typical detached, single family unit.

Table III-14: Market Rate, Multi-family Development Costs, 2014⁽¹⁾

Item	Cost	Percentage
Land Cost/Unit ⁽²⁾	\$50,000	10%
Construction Cost/Unit ^(4,5,8)	\$300,00	62%
Soft Costs/Unit (Permits, Fees, Financing, Legal and Architecture) ^(3,6,7)	\$128,070	28%
Total Development Costs/Unit	\$478,070	100%

Source: Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department

Notes:

- (1) Based on a prototype of a 40-unit multi-family development consisting of units averaging 900 sq. ft. each.
- (2) Assumes the purchase of a lot or lots whose total area is at least one acre in size and costs \$2,000,000.
- (3) Fees are based on the cost to develop a parcel in Ashland, Cherryland or San Lorenzo, as was the case with the example above; fees for water service are higher in Castro Valley.
- (4) Each unit has its own kitchen and laundry facilities are in each unit.

- (5) Assumes that surface parking is available and adequate to support the new development.
- (6) Does not include, or assume annexation fees.
- (7) Does not assume that a grading permit, or additional engineering is required as a result of being in a flood zone or the Alquist-Priolo Act.
- (8) Does not assume that remediation is required to develop the site.

Costs of greenfield subdivision housing development may be less than infill housing (depending on the cost of the land, which varies considerably depending on the degree to which necessary approvals have been granted). While fees are much higher in greenfield development (15-17%) in order to cover the expense of new infrastructure and services, efficiencies of scale often reduce construction costs. However, future greenfield housing development in Unincorporated Alameda County is unlikely due to the Measure D Initiative, which established an urban growth boundary contiguous to city boundaries. It is possible that through annexation to a city, previous unincorporated lands could be developed, but in this case, the land would no longer be under Alameda County jurisdiction.

ADDITIONAL CONSTRAINTS

Neighborhood Sentiment

Neighborhood concerns and opposition to higher-density developments and to affordable housing developments can hamper efforts to construct new housing in the Unincorporated County. As in many other jurisdictions, there can be resistance to change in familiar environments. The “Not In My Backyard” or NIMBY syndrome can be a significant constraint to the development of housing. While there is general agreement that housing should be available to all income levels, there can be resistance to specific affordable housing proposals, particularly rental housing projects, based on a lack of information or misinformation, a poor image of such developments, and/or concerns that an area already has a disproportionately large number of high density housing units.

Many of the higher density housing projects in the Unincorporated County were built during the 1950s, 60s, and 70s. The quality of construction during this era was extremely variable. Some of the projects were constructed with little attention to context and architectural detail, creating a negative image of higher density. The ubiquitous “motel style” buildings, oriented perpendicular to the street on lots formerly occupied by single family homes, are often cited as the reason that more multi-family housing should be discouraged. Maintenance on some of these properties has been inconsistent. Some properties have been the source of neighborhood complaints and code enforcement actions.

The County Community Development Agency is trying to address these concerns in various ways. The Planning Department is developing a set of design guidelines which will help guide larger multi-family developments. The Code Enforcement section of the Planning Department consistently works to correct violations. The Housing and Community Development Department works with developers to identify and finance appropriately attractive, affordable housing projects and, after construction, monitors the properties to make sure that proper property management is maintained.

The rebuilding and rehabilitation of older housing projects will greatly improved the quality, image, and acceptability of affordable housing. Successful, new low-income housing

developments enhance many neighborhoods and blend, unnoticed, into others.

Housing Discrimination

Housing discrimination is prohibited by the federal Fair Housing Act of 1968, as amended in 1988, based on race, religion, color, national origin, gender, physical or mental disability (including AIDS/HIV+), and familial status. The State of California also bans housing discrimination under the State Fair Employment and Housing Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act, providing the same broad coverage as the federal law. In addition, State law bans housing discrimination based on marital status and sexual orientation. These laws provide protections against unequal treatment in a person's search for housing to rent or buy, mortgage lending, insurance and appraisal practices, and advertising. It is also illegal to threaten or intimidate a person in a protected class or any person who supports persons in the pursuit of their rights, or to engage in blockbusting and steering. Discriminating practices continue to be a constraint on housing in Alameda County, including the unincorporated county. Because of this, Alameda County HCD provides fair housing services through its contract with the Eden Council for Hope and Opportunity (ECHO). Fair Housing services are provided in English, with translation services available. ECHO investigates housing discrimination complaints, provides public education and outreach, provides training on fair housing laws, recruits and trains testers for investigating complaints. In addition ECHO provides counseling to victims of discrimination.

Administrative remedies for housing discrimination are available through the California State Department of Fair Employment and Housing and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD investigates most discrimination complaints on mortgage lending due to the length of time, nature, and cost of such investigations.

CHAPTER IV- SITES INVENTORY AND CAPACITY ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the land available for the development of housing in the unincorporated areas of Alameda County and the County's ability to satisfy its share of the region's future housing needs.

REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA)

The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) determines the amount of housing needed for income groups in each region based on existing housing need and expected population growth. For the 2014-2022 housing element planning cycle, the housing need was based on population projections produced by the California Department of Finance which took into consideration the extraordinary uncertainty regarding national, State and local economies and housing markets. Each jurisdiction's share of the regional housing demand is prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process. For this RHNA cycle only, HCD made an adjustment to account for abnormally high vacancies and unique market conditions due to prolonged recessionary conditions, high unemployment, and unprecedented foreclosures.

The RHNA methodology, new to this cycle, expands upon the inclusion of compact growth principles that began with the 2007-2014 RHNA methodology. The methodology used for this planning cycle was developed by the Housing Methodology Committee, of which the Alameda County Planning Department was a member. Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) strengthened the coordination between housing and transportation planning. SB 375 (2008) requires that each region plan for future housing needs and complementary land uses, which in turn must be supported by a transportation investment strategy with a goal of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Further, the RHNA must be consistent with the development pattern included in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Bay Area's sustainable growth framework is built around Priority Development Areas (PDAs). PDAs are existing neighborhoods near transit nominated by jurisdictions as appropriate locations for future growth. For this cycle, 70 percent of the region's housing need is allocated based on growth in PDAs.

Initially, the Jobs-Housing Connection Strategy (a component of the Sustainable Communities Strategy) substantially increased the number of units forecast for the three largest cities in the Bay Area (San Jose, San Francisco, and Oakland), adding approximately 36,000 units between 2010 and 2040. However, many of these core cities require investments in transit infrastructure, utilities, and improvements in public services before they can assume a high level of housing production. Taking this factor into account along with the expected pace of recovery from the current housing and fiscal crisis, ABAG shifted a small share of housing production (1.5 percent) from Oakland, San Jose, and Newark to the balance of the region. Additionally, the law requires that the RHNA not only provide guidance on the number of total units produced by a jurisdiction, but specifically allocations for affordable housing. The allocations are broken out by very low-, low-, moderate- and above moderate-income populations. Income distribution was shifted in this cycle so that counties with residents below the regional median household income (such as in Alameda, Napa, San Francisco, Solano, and Sonoma) experienced shifts towards a greater concentration in the above moderate income category. This promotes the objectives for reducing concentrations of poverty and increasing the mix of housing types among cities and counties equitably.

State Housing Element law also requires that the County project the need for extremely low income households (at or below 30% of area median income). The County has assumed that half of the very low income need is for extremely low income families, yielding an estimated need of 215 units.

In summary, the RHNA requires the County to plan to accommodate 1,769 housing units between January 2015 and June 2023, of which 215 should be for extremely low-income households, 215 should be affordable to very low-income households, 227 to low-income households, 295 to moderate-income households, and 817 to above-moderate-income households. Table III-1 illustrates this breakdown.

Table IV-1: Regional Housing Need Allocation (January 1, 2015 - October 31, 2023)

Income Category	Extremely Low/ Very Low < 50% AMI	Low < 80% AMI	Moderate <120% AMI	Above Moderate >120% AMI	Total
Unit Count	430	227	295	817	1,769

AMI = Area Median Income

To demonstrate adequate capacity, the element must include a detailed inventory and analysis of land suitable for residential development. This inventory has been placed in Appendix A. The determination of suitable sites to include in the inventory was based on what sites could be available for residential use in the planning period. Other characteristics the County must consider when evaluating the appropriateness of sites include physical features (e.g. susceptibility to flooding, slope instability or erosion, or environmental considerations) and location (proximity to transit, job centers, and public or community services).

The State Department of Housing and Community Development permits a jurisdiction to consider all of the following:

- vacant residentially zoned sites;
- vacant non-residentially zoned sites that allow residential development;
- underutilized residentially zoned sites capable of being developed at a higher density or with greater intensity; and
- non-residentially zoned sites that can be redeveloped for, and/or rezoned for, residential use (via program actions)

Progress towards Meeting the RHNA Goals

ABAG uses January 1, 2014 as the baseline for growth projections for the Housing Element planning period of 2014-2022. As a result, jurisdictions may count toward the RHNA goals any new units built, under construction, or approved since January 1, 2014. Table III-1 presents a summary of the County's progress towards achieving its RHNA allocation.

Units Constructed or Permitted

Since January 2014, 14 housing units have been constructed¹⁵ or permitted by the Alameda County Building Inspection Division. These units have the following income distribution: 2 low income units, 3 moderate income units, and 9 above moderate income units. Building valuations obtained from the building permit estimates the value of these dwellings to range

¹⁵ For the purposes of this analysis, units constructed are those that have been granted certificates of occupancy.

from \$83,720 to \$2,071,560. The two units with valuations of less than \$100,000 are presumed affordable for a low income household. Three units had valuations of approximately \$340,000 and were presumed to be affordable to a moderate income household. For more information, please refer to Table I-58 which uses the HUD income levels to estimate the maximum affordable purchase or rental price for a one to four person household. The County has chosen to use the analysis in Table I-58 as the basis for its estimates of the affordability of dwelling units within the unincorporated areas.

Affordable Housing Developments

The Alameda County Economic and Civic Development Department and Department of Housing and Community Development provide financial support to several affordable housing developments within the unincorporated areas. The County has partnered with Mercy Housing for the funding and development a 77 unit senior housing project to be located in San Lorenzo. Entitlements for this project were finalized in June of 2014.

Second Unit Construction

Two secondary units have already been permitted or constructed during the current planning period. Although it is not required that these units be rented, based on their valuation staff assumed that they could be rented for \$1,500 or less. As a result, these units may be considered affordable to low income households.

Units Approved/Entitled

As of June 2014, 11 projects have received entitlements, representing 74 new housing units which have not yet received building permits. Although staff has no building valuation data on these units, based on the approved density, staff believes that these units will be affordable to above moderate income households.

Pending Development Activities

As of June 2014, 10 projects that would result in an additional 98 units (29 single family and 69 multifamily) were under consideration by the Planning Department. As these applications have not been approved, staff cannot make an accurate determination of their affordability nor can they be truly considered development "credits"; however, the data provides a forecast of anticipated residential development activity in the unincorporated areas. Once these units are approved permitted or constructed, staff will be able to make a better informed determination of their affordability.

Accommodating the Remaining RHNA Units

With units constructed, under construction, permitted, approved, and pending, the County has already met a portion of its RHNA. The County has a remaining RHNA of 1,506 units, for which it must provide sufficient land to accommodate: 430 very low income units; 227 low income units; 295 moderate income units; and 817 above moderate income units. Table IV-2 provides a summary of this data.

Table IV-2: Units Completed or Approved by Affordability Level, June 2014

Project	Total Units	Units by Income Level				Method of Affordability Determination
		VL	L	M	AM	
Units Completed/Permitted						
Single Family Residences	12			3	9	Sales Price or Valuation
Two – Four Unit Buildings						
Affordable Housing						
Multi-family (5 or more units)						
Second Units	2		2			Potential Rent Price
Substantial Rehabilitation						
Units Approved/Entitled						
Single Family Residences	74				74	Project density
Two – Four Unit Buildings						
Affordable Housing	77		77			County Subsidy
Multi-family (5 or more units)						
RHNA Credits	165		79	3	83	
Pending Development	98					Not yet determined
RHNA	1,769	430	227	295	817	
Remaining RHNA	1,506	430	148	292	734	

VACANT AND UNDERUTILIZED SITES ANALYSIS FOR MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

The Sites Inventory identifies vacant and underutilized sites that have the greatest redevelopment potential during the planning period. These parcels were selected based on the following criteria: the age of the improvements on the site; the evidence, as supported by building records, of a lack of recent tenant improvements; and a ratio of improvements versus land value less than 1. In general, newer properties are less likely to be redeveloped, as are properties where there have been recent investments. The County also considered development patterns in the area and found that most of the residential development activity, as demonstrated by recent subdivisions (2012 and 2013) and site development review applications, has occurred on parcels where there was an existing use. Based on this data one could conclude that active land uses historically have not been a barrier to new residential development. Finally, the County also reviewed market conditions within the County and throughout the Bay Area and observed that residential development is generally characterized by high land and construction costs, combined with a limited supply of vacant developable land; thus leading to redevelopment of non-vacant sites.

The unincorporated portion of Alameda County contains many well established communities. The County’s goal is to encourage housing development that is consistent with existing patterns of neighborhood development and current zoning. The Alameda County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance have guided staff in evaluating which areas are appropriate for future housing development. As a result the County has chosen to highlight infill sites with the potential for transit oriented and mixed use development. These sites are located in the Castro Valley and Eden Area Plans. A detailed sites inventory has been included in Appendix A.

Priority Development Areas

California Senate Bill 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (SB 375) strengthened coordination between regional housing allocation and transportation planning. Under SB 375, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is required to incorporate a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The SCS is intended to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions. To that end, regional housing allocation planning should be designed to achieve GHG emission reduction goals by developing efficient land-use strategies such as infill, mixed-use, and/or downtown revitalization strategies, promote and incentivize a variety of housing types affordable to the workforce and households with lower incomes, and address climate change by reducing vehicle trips. In an effort to meet overlapping objectives of SB 375 and Housing Element law, the Association of Bay Area Governments adopted “Plan Bay Area” with the following objectives:

- Increase supply, diversity and affordability of housing
- Promote infill development and more efficient land use patterns
- Promote intraregional relationship between jobs and housing
- Protect environmental resources
- Promote socioeconomic equity

The Bay Area’s sustainable growth framework known as Plan Bay Area is built around the concept of “Priority Development Areas” (PDAs). Priority Development Areas are existing neighborhoods near transit, nominated by jurisdictions as appropriate locations for future growth. Alameda County has four PDAs within its jurisdiction, they are:

- E14th Street/Mission Blvd Corridor
- Meekland Avenue Corridor
- Hesperian Boulevard Corridor
- Castro Valley BART Station Area

In addition, to the four PDA’s described above, a portion of the Bay Fair BART PDA is within Unincorporated Alameda County. In order to coordinate planning efforts within that area, Alameda County also has signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of San Leandro to develop a specific plan for a transit oriented development (TOD) located at the Bay Fair BART station.

Planned PDAs are intended to designate growth areas. Most of the opportunity sites identified in the Housing Element fall within the County’s PDAs. Planned PDAs are eligible for funding from MTC and other Bay Area agencies for infrastructure, transportation and housing necessary to support development in those areas. Therefore, Alameda County has positioned itself through the identification of opportunity sites within PDAs to accommodate future growth in a sustainable manner that achieves regional objectives of enhancing existing neighborhoods, reducing congestion, and protecting natural resources.

Beyond the requirements specified in State Housing Element law and SB 375, the comprehensive Plan Bay Area effort will support housing allocations under the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) through targeted transportation investments funded under the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG). The funding criteria for OBAG takes into account local jurisdictions’ past housing production and the 2014-2022 RHNA, for both total units and affordable units. The OBAG program also emphasizes the importance of planning for housing

by requiring that jurisdictions have a Housing Element certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to be eligible for funding.

Methodology

The County's evaluation of adequate sites began with a listing of those parcels that were identified in the 2010 Housing Element Inventory. These sites are available and could be realistically developed by 2023 as required by State HCD.

To demonstrate the realistic development viability of the sites, the inventory describes: (1) whether appropriate zoning is in place, (2) the applicable development standards and their impact on projected development capacity and affordability, (3) existing constraints including any known environmental issues, and the (4) availability of existing and planned public service capacity levels.

The County's land inventory was developed with the use of a combination of resources including the County's GIS database, updated Assessor's data, field surveys, and review of the County's various plans and Zoning Ordinance. The inventory includes both small and large residentially and non-residentially zoned parcels and parcels that are substantially vacant or underutilized and could be developed for more intense residential uses. The compilation resulted in not only an identification of sites, but also an estimate of potential development capacity for these sites. The majority of the land available for residential development is located in: (1) areas currently served by public transit, (2) within specific plan areas that are zoned R-S, R-2, R-3, and R-4 that allow duplexes and multi-family residential development, and (3) within planning areas that provide for mixed use development.

The identified sites are near the main commercial corridors within Eden and Castro Valley Plan areas. These areas contain several parcels that have been designated for higher density development relative to most residential areas in the unincorporated areas. In addition to avoiding the low-density residential areas, these commercial areas are suited for new housing units because they have transit access and existing services. Furthermore, there are currently no known service limits to these sites, although developers would be required to pay fees or construct public improvements prior to or concurrent with development. A map of these areas has been included in Appendix A.

Non-vacant and underutilized sites were also screened using the following criteria:

- Improvements are at least 30 years old
- Existing number of units is less than 70% of the maximum allowable density for the zoning district
- Improvement to land value ratio is less than 1; the land is more valuable than the structure

After the initial GIS screening orthophotos were reviewed to confirm the status of the sites, evaluate any possible environmental constraints requiring further study (i.e. slopes, creeks, etc.), and the sites consolidation potential. Field visits were also used for sites with the capacity to develop 10 or more units.

Realistic Development Capacity

The realistic development capacity is an estimate of a parcel's residential development potential. To generate this figure, first, the County considered current zoning standards for residential development within the aforementioned zoning districts to determine an approximate

density and unit yield. These standards included parking requirements, building height limitations, setbacks, open space requirements, driveways, and pedestrian access. Second, staff has evaluated recent development in the unincorporated area and has determined that average residential development density is over 80% of maximum permitted density. A summary of this data is provided below.

Table IV-3: Sample of Buildout Capacities

Project	Acreage	Zone	Maximum Units	Actual Units	Resulting du/acre
16100 Maubert	0.70	R-S-D-3/PD	10	10	16
19505 Meekland	0.54	R-S-D-3/PD	8	9	16
1168 Elgin	0.39	R-S-D-20	8	5	13
Liberty Point	0.96	R-S-D-15/PD	29	24	25
20560 Forest	1.61	R-S-D-20/PD	35	28	19
334 Cherry Way	0.50	R-S-SU	4	3	6

Source: Alameda County Planning Department and Dyett and Bhatia and Khan Mortimer and Associates, 2010

The County’s Site Inventory relies heavily on parcels that are currently zoned for multi-family residential development to accommodate its regional share of housing for lower income households. The corresponding zoning designations are R-S (residential suburban), R-2 (two family dwellings), R-3 (up to four dwelling units) and R-4 (multi-family dwellings). The following analysis describes the County’s process in determining the realistic development capacity for parcels included within the Sites Inventory.

Also underway is a County program to develop Illustrated Design Guidelines which may limit the development potential on the identified opportunity sites. In anticipation of these changes, staff has chosen to calculate the realistic development capacity for parcels listed within the Sites Inventory at 75% of their maximum development capacity as permitted by zoning. Although the implementation of the Design Guidelines is months away, as an added measure to consider their potential impact on the inventory, staff believes the 75% number is adequate to address any reduction in unit yield that may result.

Small Sites

Generally smaller sites (parcels less than 0.5 acres) have been included in the County’s Site Inventory when lot consolidation is feasible or when the current development is less than 70% of the maximum density per zoning. When assessing the feasibility of smaller sites, parcels that are 5,000 square feet or more that are zoned at a density permitting at least 12 units per acre or more are included in the inventory. This lot size is the minimum residential lot size and such densities are ideal for multi-family dwellings. Such housing provides affordable options for moderate-income households.

When calculating the realistic development capacity of the individual sites, the potential for lot mergers was not considered in the formal analysis. The realistic development capacity figure is a conservative estimate of a parcel’s unit yield. The figure does not rely upon assumptions about which lots would be consolidated. In the past, there have been residential developments that have required the merger of 2 or more parcels. This is certain to occur in the future; however, predicting which parcels would be consolidated is difficult, particularly where there are many parcels adjacent to one another. Rather than providing an arbitrary listing of consolidated parcels, and risk inflating the County’s development capacity estimates, it was decided to

consider the sites in their current configurations. However, the County is aware that a listing of those sites that have the highest potential for consolidation would be a useful development tool. In order to meet this need, the County has provided a separate summary of those lots that may be candidates for merger within the planning period and provides a rough estimate of their realistic development capacity post merger. This information is included in Appendix A. Under its “Residential Sites Inventory” program the County will maintain a listing of sites that have the potential for consolidation.

The County has taken many steps to facilitate the development of small sites. Many of the smaller sites included within the Site Inventory are zoned R-S-DV (Residential Suburban, Density Variable). This zoning designation was created as a result of the 2003 Housing Element update with the intention of facilitating small lot consolidation and promoting better residential development. The minimum density under DV zoning is one dwelling unit per 3,500 square feet (12.45 dwelling units per acre). For those sites where average lot width is greater than 100 feet and the lot area is not less than 20,000 square feet; the density shall be one dwelling per 2,000 square feet of lot area (21.78 dwelling units per acre). In addition, the County established its Density Bonus Ordinance to provide incentives for the development of affordable housing. The County may also waive its park dedication fee requirements for affordable housing developments.

While generally not considered ideal for the development of housing affordable to low-income households, the small sites included within the inventory are appropriate for the following reasons: availability of public infrastructure (water, sewer, police, fire, schools, etc.); transit accessibility; and proximity to major employment centers. Moreover, the growth limitations imposed by Measure D upon East Alameda County, as well as the cost and availability of public infrastructure, makes affordable housing infeasible outside of the western and more urbanized portions of the County. Furthermore, environmental standards enacted by the legislature through AB 32 (2006, Nuñez) and SB 375 (2008, Steinberg) encourage infill and transit oriented development as a means to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to reverse the effects of climate change. The small sites included in the inventory are all infill development; however, many would be described as transit oriented development as well due to their proximity (less than .25 mile) to transit.

Lot Consolidation

The urbanized unincorporated areas are characterized by small parcels that are often developed at densities lower than permitted by zoning. Fragmented ownership makes the assemblage of parcels for large-scale developments such as mixed use and transit oriented development difficult, if not financially infeasible. Lot consolidation is a tool that may be used by housing developers to gain greater area upon which to develop housing, to provide for amenities (such as parking and common areas), and to provide a wider range of options for building siting, traffic flow and circulation. Thus, the Planning Department has chosen to highlight those parcels where consolidation might be appropriate. Consolidation potential was determined by analyzing those parcels that are adjacent/contiguous and have the same or comparable zoning and General Plan designations. When calculating the realistic development capacity of the individual sites, the potential for lot mergers was not considered in the formal analysis. The realistic development capacity figure is a conservative estimate of a parcel’s unit yield. The figure does not rely upon assumptions about which lots would be consolidated. Rather than providing an arbitrary listing of consolidated parcels, and risk inflating the County’s development capacity estimates, it was decided to consider the sites in their current configurations. However, the County is aware that a listing of those sites that have the highest

potential for consolidation could be a useful development tool. In order to meet this need, the County has provided a separate summary of those lots that may be candidates for merger within the planning period and provides a rough estimate of their realistic development capacity post merger. This information is included in Appendix A. Under its “Residential Sites Inventory” program the County will maintain a listing of sites that have the potential for consolidation.

The County has taken many steps to facilitate the consolidation of small sites. Many of the smaller sites included within the Site Inventory are zoned R-S-DV (Residential Suburban, Density Variable). This zoning designation was created as a result of the 2003 Housing Element update with the intention of facilitating small lot consolidation and promoting better residential development. Under DV zoning property owners are able to increase the allowable density by 75% based on the size of the site, thereby encouraging owners of adjoining properties to collaborate in development or to package parcels for sale. The minimum density under DV zoning is one dwelling unit per 3,500 square feet (12.45 dwelling units per acre). For those sites where average lot width is greater than 100 feet and the lot area is not less than 20,000 square feet; the density shall be one dwelling per 2,000 square feet of lot area (21.78 dwelling units per acre).

Other Incentives for Small Site Development

In addition to DV zoning, the County established its Density Bonus Ordinance to provide incentives for the development of affordable housing. The County may also waive its park dedication fee requirements for affordable housing developments. Finally, parties interested in developing affordable housing may partner with the County. In addition to these programs currently provided by the county to support the use of underutilized, small, infill sites the County will investigate the feasibility of providing additional incentives to encourage their development via its Housing Plan.

Mixed Use (Residential/Commercial) Sites

A significant number of sites identified in the County’s inventory are mixed use (commercial/residential sites) as specified in their respective general or specific plan. These sites have been included because of their location along commercial corridors and around transit centers, and their overall redevelopment potential. The allowable densities sited within the inventory reflect staff and community input, and is consistent with existing patterns of development. For example, sites within the Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan, have allowable densities ranging from 21.78 to 50 dwelling units per acre. The realistic development capacity was calculated assuming the site would be developed at 75% of their maximum capacity. A listing of mixed use parcels has been included in Appendix A.

Currently there is no guarantee that parcels zoned as “mixed use” will be developed to include housing units. If a proposed project would result in fewer dwelling units than projected in the Sites Inventory, as required in Government Code Section 65863 (b), the County shall make the following findings prior to project approval:

- (1) The reduction is consistent with the adopted general plan, including the housing element.
- (2) The remaining sites identified in the housing element are adequate to accommodate the jurisdiction’s share of the regional housing need pursuant to Section 65584.

The County will monitor the residential capacity of these sites during the planning period to see if additional incentives or policies are required to ensure that the County has enough capacity to meet its RHNA allocation.

The following table summarizes the contribution of mixed use sites to the Sites Inventory.

Table IV-4: Summary of Mixed Use Sites in the Sites Inventory

Specific Plan	Number of Parcels	Acres	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity	Net Yield
Ashland Cherryland Business District	32	13.53	678	510	428
Castro Valley Central Business District	9	14.09	308	231	63
San Lorenzo Village	21	29.61	590	461	461

Non-Vacant and Underutilized Sites

The majority of the parcels identified in the Sites Inventory are non-vacant or underutilized parcels in west County areas. Like many jurisdictions in the Bay Area, the western unincorporated areas of the County are “built out”. Consequently, the majority of the County’s RHNA is realized through the use of non-vacant and underutilized parcels. The geographic scope of the Sites Inventory is necessarily limited by requirements set forth in the East County Area Plan (ECAP) as amended by voter initiative, Measure D. In 2002, Measure D established an Urban Growth Boundary and amended the General Plan to limit development to the western, more urbanized portions of the County. Moreover, the parcels identified in the inventory have existing infrastructure (water, sewer, streets, sidewalks and public transit) that can accommodate the anticipated population increase over the planning period and are relatively free of environmental constraints that would prevent their redevelopment. They also have existing zoning in place that would permit the development of additional housing units. Staff considered the year of construction of the units (at least 30 years ago). Parcels were also selected when the difference between their zoned density and their realistic development capacity resulted in at least two additional units of housing. In addition, these parcels are all located within established Priority Development Areas; therefore housing developers may choose to construct dwellings in these areas due to the possibility of funding and likelihood of infrastructure improvements. As mentioned previously, within unincorporated Alameda County most of the development activity occurs on parcels where there is an existing use. Raw land costs, growth policies, consumer preference, and the costs of infrastructure have encouraged the redevelopment of non-vacant and underutilized sites within Alameda County; therefore, similar parcels were selected for inclusion in the Sites Inventory. Planning Department data as well as regional trends indicate that the demand for such sites will remain throughout the planning period.

The Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development is currently developing an affordable housing strategy for the unincorporated areas that will address housing needs during the current planning period. This strategy may rely on so called “Boomerang” funds, funds that previously would have gone to support Redevelopment Agencies and their development activities. The County is working proactively with various community organizations to establish a funding mechanism for affordable housing development and to inform the public of the housing opportunity sites specified in the Sites Inventory. These actions will be implemented within the first year of the planning period and are included in the County’s Housing Plan.

Development Potential by Unincorporated Community

The urban unincorporated areas consist of the communities of Ashland, Cherryland, Castro Valley, Fairview, Hayward Acres and San Lorenzo. The following table summarizes the development capacity by unincorporated community.

Table IV-5: Development Potential by Unincorporated Community

Community	# of Units	# of Parcels	% of Total Units
Ashland	449	26	20%
Cherryland	413	91	18%
Castro Valley	402	62	18%
Fairview	223	52	10%
Hayward Acres	335	57	15%
San Lorenzo	444	22	20%
Total Capacity	2,266	310	100%

Source: Alameda County Planning Department

State Route 238 Study Area

Twenty six parcels identified on the Sites Inventory are currently owned by the State of California, and are under the supervision of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). These parcels were obtained by the State over 40 years ago as a part of a planned expansion and redesign of State Route 238. Through a series of legal actions initiated by local residents, the project was stopped, although the parcels have remained under State ownership. At this time, Caltrans has begun the process to dispose of the surplus parcels.

Among all of the small parcels included in the Sites Inventory, the parcels within the 238 study area have the greatest potential for lot consolidation as all parcels are owned by the State. Yet, the County has chosen to not assume lot consolidation in its estimates of development capacity as provided in Tables III-5 and III-6. Consistent with the methodology and rationale provided in the section above entitled "Small Sites", the County has calculated the realistic development capacity based upon the sites' current configuration and zoning. A summary of all parcels listed on the Sites Inventory (not just those that are within the Route 238 Study area) that may be candidates for mergers has been provided in Appendix A.

ZONING APPROPRIATE TO ACCOMMODATE HOUSING FOR LOWER AND MODERATE INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

As per AB 2348 Government Code Section 65583.2(c)(3)(B), the County has identified sites that may be developed at densities of 30 or more units per acre as feasible for the development of housing affordable to low income households. The purpose of this default density standard is to provide a numerical density standard for local governments, resulting in greater certainty in the housing element review process. No further analysis is required to establish the adequacy of sites density with respect to affordable housing development for low income households. Using the default density as a baseline estimate, the county has determined that sites that can be developed at densities between 13 and 22 units per acre are assumed to be affordable to moderate income households. Parcels zoned at this density are appropriate for the development of medium density housing developments such as duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes. None of the parcels identified in the Sites Inventory require rezoning to accommodate the housing needs of lower and moderate income households.

TRANSIT ORIENTED AND MIXED USE DISTRICTS

The County's site inventory includes parcels that are located in close proximity to public transit, and in areas that are currently zoned to accommodate mixed uses. The County will seek opportunities to encourage such developments as part of its Infill, Mixed Use and Transit Oriented Developments program which is described in the County's Housing Plan.

ADEQUACY OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

A lack of adequate infrastructure or public services and facilities can be a substantial constraint to residential development if it is to avoid impacting existing residents. As a result, developers cannot receive building permits to initiate construction without demonstrating water availability, and either sewer availability or the ability to accommodate septic systems.

These standards ensure that the infrastructure and public services and facilities are in place to serve that particular development. These standards are implemented through payment of fees and exaction and site improvements discussed within the chapter entitled "Housing Constraints" under the heading "Development Impact Fees".

Many of the County's affordable housing developments are located in infill locations currently served by existing infrastructure. While such infill sites are beneficial in that they do not require the extension of services, provide housing near public transit and jobs, encourage economic growth in urban areas, and thus promote "smart growth" development principles, they may face other challenges to development. Infill sites in the older communities in the County may require upgrading of existing infrastructure systems to support more intense development, such as roadway improvements, and replacement of undersized sewer and water lines.

ADEQUACY OF RESIDENTIAL SITES INVENTORY

The County must demonstrate adequate sites to accommodate its RHNA goals of 1,769 units. The County's residential sites potential is composed of the following:

- vacant residentially zoned sites;
- vacant non-residentially zoned sites that allow residential development;
- underutilized residentially zoned sites capable of being developed at a higher density or with greater intensity; and
- non-residentially zoned sites that can be redeveloped for, and/or rezoned for, residential use (via program actions); and
- Second units

The table below provides a summary of the units constructed, permitted, approved/ entitled, or planned between January 1, 2014, and June 2014, as well as additional units that can be accommodated on sites identified as having residential development potential. Based on planned development and capacity of vacant and underutilized sites, the County can accommodate an additional 2,266 units of housing which is sufficient to cover the County's remaining housing need. Pending multi-family residential development projects and subdivision activities provide 165 additional units. The table below summarizes the County's RHNA status.

Table IV-6: RHNA Status

	Total	Income Level			
		Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate
RHNA	1,769	430	227	295	817
RHNA Credits	165		79	3	83
Pending Development	98				
Sites Capacity	2,266	634		408	1,224
RHNA Credits, Pending Development and Site Capacity vs. Remaining RHNA	(760)	(56)		(116)	(490)

CHAPTER V- OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENERGY CONSERVATION

Although the County has long championed sustainability efforts, it is also compelled to act due to two California laws: Senate Bill 375 (SB 375 or the Sustainable Communities Act), Steinberg, 2008; and Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32 or the Global Warming Solutions Act), Nunez, 2006. The goal of SB 375 is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by curbing urban sprawl via improved coordination of land use and transportation policy. AB 32 established a statewide goal to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. Furthermore, AB 32 requires that GHG emissions are evaluated and analyzed within Environmental Impact Reports and General Plans to determine their impact and if necessary propose mitigation strategies.

The Relationship of the Housing Element to Regional Planning Efforts

SB 375 requires California's 18 metro areas to integrate transportation, land-use and housing as part of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks. In the Bay Area, this requires the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to adopt an SCS that meets greenhouse gas reduction targets adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The local plan, of which Alameda County is a part, is called Plan Bay Area.

The SCS must also identify areas that can accommodate part of a locality's Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), and that the RHNA reflect the SCS. Many goals of Plan Bay Area are facilitated through focusing growth in Priority Development Areas (PDAs).

A key component of the County's General Plan is the concept of promoting transit-oriented development (TOD). This implies locating housing near transportation corridors, well served by public transportation and with access to goods and services, thus reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips, improving neighborhoods, and reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. The County implements TODs through the establishment of four transit-oriented Priority Development Areas.

The four PDAs have been approved by the Board of Supervisors, and later by ABAG, for future growth. Each of these areas is accessible to transit, jobs, shopping and other services. Projections from Plan Bay Area state collectively PDAs have the capacity "to absorb about 80 percent of new housing and over 60 percent of new jobs on less than five percent of the Bay Area's land. The result is a locally supported, compact and efficient growth pattern that meets CARB's GHG reduction targets and provides adequate housing for the Bay Area's growing population." There are currently four PDAs located within Unincorporated Alameda County, they are as follows:

- E14th Street/Mission Boulevard Corridor
- Meekland Avenue Corridor
- Hesperian Boulevard Corridor
- Castro Valley BART Station Area

Although the City of San Leandro is the lead jurisdiction with respect to the Bay Fair BART TOD PDA, Alameda County staff is engaged in the planning for that area. The largest single parcel within the PDA is within unincorporated Alameda County, and so the County has a pivotal role to play in future development within the PDA.

County Planning Efforts

The following is a list of policy related documents either in use or under development within the County which promote sustainability, mixed use and transit-oriented development, pedestrian and bicycle friendly design:

- Community Climate Action Plan, 2014
- Castro Valley General Plan, 2012
- Alameda County Housing Element (2009-14) (Under Revision)
- Eden Area General Plan, 2010
- Design Guidelines and Development Standards (In Development)
- Bicycle Master Plan, 2007
- Pedestrian Master Plan, 2006
- San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan, 2004
- East County Area Plan/Measure D, 2002
- Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plan, 1995 (Under Revision) Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan, 1993

Of the aforementioned policies, the County's Community Climate Action Plan (CCAP) builds on existing General Plan policies to provide additional opportunities for energy conservation. The CCAP facilitates energy conservation in the following ways:

- **Transportation:** The CCAP has several actions designed to improve alternative transportation opportunities and facilities. The Public Works Agency has begun planning improvements for bike and pedestrian ways, and for example, plans to significantly upgrade the Grant Avenue corridor for non-motorized transportation beginning in September 2013. Certain private development projects are being required to install bike racks and special parking restrictions, as well as explore ways to encourage the use of public transit.
- **Alternative Energy:** The CCAP has many measures designed to increase the use of alternative energy. On certain private projects, solar photovoltaic cells are being included as conditions of approval. The Neighborhood Preservation and Sustainability Department of CDA has programs for weatherproofing and making residential units more energy efficient. For some time now, that department has been assisting with grants for improvements in energy efficiency, also a key aspect of the CCAP measures. Certain new private development projects are being encouraged to incorporate alternative energy.
- **Water Conservation:** The CCAP has several measures devoted to water conservation in new development and landscaping; conservation of water reduces the need for water treatment, a process that uses a great deal of energy, and thus reduces the carbon footprint for new and replacement landscaping and commercial / industrial processes. The County has already adopted a Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (WELO) to this end. To minimize the inefficient use of water in new and rehabilitated landscapes, this ordinance prescribes the use of drought tolerant and low water use plants for the largest landscaped areas, with high water use plants designated for accent areas. Turf is minimized, with the exception of sport fields and other uses that require turf for their use. Landscape development packages that are compliant with WELO include irrigation plans and hydrozone scheduling that group plants with similar water needs.

- **Waste Reduction and Recycling:** The CCAP has a variety of measures related to reduction of waste and enhanced recycling. County Staff continues to work to bring recycling to underserved Unincorporated areas, to support food waste capture, and to encourage composting of all organic wastes as the landfills and private companies bring proposals to the County.

Title 24

State of California Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings were established in 1978 in response to a legislative mandate to reduce California's energy consumption. The standards are codified in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and are updated periodically to allow consideration and possible incorporation of new energy efficiency technologies and methods. Title 24 sets forth mandatory energy standards and requires the adoption of an “energy budget” for all new residential buildings and additions to residential buildings. Separate requirements are adopted for “low-rise” residential construction (i.e., no more than 3 stories) and non-residential buildings, which includes hotels, motels, and multi-family residential buildings with four or more habitable stories. The standards specify energy saving design for lighting, walls, ceilings and floor installations, as well as heating and cooling equipment and systems, gas cooling devices, conservation standards and the use of non-depleting energy sources, such as solar energy or wind power. Within Unincorporated Alameda County, the Public Works Agency, Building Inspections Division is responsible for enforcing the energy conservation regulations through the plan check and building inspection processes.

Residential Rehabilitation Programs

The County’s HOME and CDBG funded residential rehabilitation and development programs encourage the use of energy conservation features. Weatherization improvements and installation of energy-efficient systems are eligible activities under the County’s rehabilitation assistance programs such as the Single-Family Home Repair Loan Program and Multi-family Rehabilitation Program.

Green Building and Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinances

The County offers a Green Building and Water Efficient Landscaping Ordinances which are designed to promote the use of resource efficient construction materials, water conservation, and energy efficiency in new and remodeled residential and commercial buildings. The County complies with the requirements of the Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) Provision, commonly referred to as “C.3”. Under this program the County is required to monitor development to minimize impervious surfaces and promote the use of trees, vegetated swales, and rain gardens that not only reduce runoff but also save energy by reducing heat.

As a part of its Housing Plan, Alameda County has included several initiatives intended to reduce negative impacts often associated with residential development. Please refer to Chapter 4 for more information.

CHAPTER VI- OTHER REQUIREMENTS

CONSISTENCY WITH OTHER GENERAL PLAN ELEMENTS AND OTHER PLANNING DOCUMENTS

State law requires the elements of the General Plan to be consistent. The Housing Element is consistent with all of the other elements of the General Plan, in that it does not require any significant changes to the other elements of the General Plan, modify or relocate density, and recommend policies or action programs that would create housing at the expense of goals and policies within the General Plan. The Housing Element goals should be interpreted and implemented consistent with those in other portions of the General Plan. As the General Plan may be amended over time, goal, policies, and implementing programs in other General Plan elements will be comprehensively reviewed for internal consistency. The following text provides a brief overview of the General Plan Elements, as well as the County's process for maintaining consistency between each document.

The Alameda County General Plan consists of a number of elements, both geographic and functional. The Housing Element, one of the functional elements, was developed as a separate document containing background and policy information that is useful in guiding public and private decisions affecting housing. In the event that policies conflict with earlier elements, the more recently adopted policies will prevail.

Supplemented by background information, analysis and policy statements, the following Elements and Plans, including the updated Housing Element, comprise the comprehensive General Plan for the County:

- Community Climate Action Plan, adopted February 2014
- Safety Element, adopted January 2013, and amended February 2014
- Castro Valley Plan, adopted March 2012
- Alameda County Housing Element, adopted April 2011
- Eden Area General Plan, adopted March 2010
- East County Area Plan, adopted May 1994; modified by voters through Measure D, November, 2000, codified by Board of Supervisors May, 2002
- Open Space Element, adopted May 1973, and amended May 1994
- Conservation Element, adopted January 1976, and amended May 1994
- Noise Element, adopted January 1976, and amended May 1994
- Park and Recreation Element, adopted June 1956, and amended May 1994
- Scenic Route Element, adopted May 1966, and amended May 1994

The *East County Area Plan*, adopted in 1993, modified by County-wide voters through Measure D, in November, 2000, modifications codified by Board May, 2002. That measure sets an Urban Growth Boundary beyond which no urban development may occur except under very limited specified circumstances. It does provide that "To the maximum extent feasible, the County shall meet State housing obligations for the East County Area within the County Urban Growth Boundary." It further states:

If State-imposed housing obligations make it necessary to go beyond the Urban Growth Boundary, the voters of the County may approve an extension of the Boundary. The Board of Supervisors may approve housing beyond an Urban Growth Boundary only if:

(1) It is indisputable that there is no land within the Urban Growth Boundary to meet a State housing requirement either through new development, more intensive development, or redevelopment; (2) no more land is used outside the Urban Growth Boundary than is required by the affordable housing necessary to meet a State obligation; (3) the area is adjacent to the Urban Growth Boundary, or to an existing urban or intensive residential area; (4) the percentage goals for low- and very low-income housing in Policy 42 [21% moderate, 15% low, and 21% very low-income housing] will be met in any housing approved; (5) there will be adequate public facilities and services for the housing; and (6) the development shall not be on prime agricultural lands, or lands designated, at least conditionally, for intensive agriculture, unless no other land is available under this Policy.

Consistent with Measure D, the County has not identified sites outside of the Urban Growth Boundary for development.

In addition, the County is currently revising its Resource, Conservation and Open Space Elements and is working on an additional Agriculture Element to the General Plan. These Elements will be cross-referenced with the Housing Element to ensure that they are consistent with one another.

NOTIFICATION OF WATER AND SEWER PROVIDERS

Upon adoption and certification of this Housing Element, the Alameda County will provide a copy of the Housing Element to the East Bay Municipal Water District, Zone 7 Water District and Oro Loma Sanitary District, pursuant to Government Code Section 65589.7. The purpose of this notification is to ensure that these providers of water and sewer services place a priority for proposed housing developments for lower-income households in their current and future resource or service allocations.

REVIEW OF CONSERVATION AND SAFETY ELEMENTS PER AB 162

Assembly Bill 162 requires that Alameda County review, and if necessary, identify new information for its Conservation and Safety Elements of its General Plan upon the next revision of the Housing Element, on or after January 1, 2009. Specifically, these elements must be revised to include analysis and policies regarding flood hazard and management information. The purpose of this review is to identify rivers, creeks, streams, flood corridors, riparian habitat, and land that may accommodate floodwater for purposes of groundwater recharge and stormwater management. An update of the Safety Element was completed in 2013, and amendments to the County's Conservation Element are in development.

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A: SITES INVENTORY AND MAP**
- APPENDIX B: EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS ELEMENT**
- APPENDIX C: HOUSING PLAN SUMMARY**
- APPENDIX D: GLOSSARY**
- APPENDIX E: ACRONYMS**
- APPENDIX F: SOURCES**
- APPENDIX G: QUALIFIED ENTITIES**
- APPENDIX H: SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**
- APPENDIX I: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PREVIOUS ELEMENT**
- APPENDIX J: HOUSING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES**

This page has been intentionally left blank

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M1	080C048403004	936	Delano St	R-1		8.71	19,110	0.44	Res, Single Family Residence	1958	Y	N	1	4	3	2		Ashland/ Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
M2	080C048403300	964	Delano St	R-1		8.71	28,729	0.66	Res, Single Family Residence	1951	Y	N	2	6	4	2	Merger potential for M2 and M5	Ashland/ Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
M3	080C048402306	820	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	46,008	1.06	Res, Single Family Residence	1940	Y	N	1	18	14	13	Merger potential for M3 and M4	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M4	080C048402500	854	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	21,399	0.49	Res, Multi, 2-4 Single Family Homes	1923	Y	N	2	9	6	4	Merger potential for M3 and M4	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M5	080C048403600	928	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	39,533	0.91	Res, Single Family Residence	1948	Y	N	1	16	12	11	Merger potential for M2 and M5	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M6	080C048500504	887	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	10,096	0.23	Res, Single Family Residence	1967	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential for M6 and M7	Ashland/ Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
M7	080C048500604	895	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	10,654	0.24	Res, Single Family Residence	1930	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential for M6 and M7	Ashland/ Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
M8	080C048500802	925	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	14,032	0.32	Res, Single Family Residence	1932	Y	N	1	6	4	3		Ashland/ Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
M9	080D056301700		Dermoddy Ave	R-3/R-4		30.00	37,897	0.87	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	26	20	20	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M10	080D056502900		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	84,071	1.93	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	58	43	43	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, watercourse near property. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M11	080D056503000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	43,560	1.00	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	30	23	23	Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M12	080D056803000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	65,776	1.51	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	45	34	34	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M13	080D056803100		Wagner St	R-S	D-15	30.00	78,844	1.81	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	54	41	41	Creek/watercourse close to property. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M14	080 005704000	16110	E 14th	ACBD	TA	50.00	55,500	1.27	Retail Sales		Y	N	0	64	48	48	Approved for 48 units	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M15	080C047600100	16035	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,882	0.20	Commercial, Miscellaneous, Improved	1932	Y	N	0	10	8	8	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M16	080C047600200	16039	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,970	0.18	One story store	1947	Y	N	0	9	7	7	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M17	080C047600300	16043	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,390	0.16	Commercial, Miscellaneous, Improved	1930	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M18	080C047600501	16064	Ashland Ave	ACBD	TA	50.00	10,560	0.24	Four living units; e.g. fourplex or triplex w/SFR	1910	Y	N	4	12	9	5	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M19	080C047601101	16151	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,869	0.16	One story store	1942	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M20	080C047601103	16115	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	111,514	2.56	Mobile home park	1950	Y	N	44	128	96	52	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M21	080C049500103	16021	Ashland Ave	ACBD	TA	50.00	81,881	1.88	Warehouse	1991	Y	Y	0	94	70	70	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M22	080C050002401	15951	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	16,783	0.39	One story store	1981	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M23	080C050002500	15957	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	12,851	0.30	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1960	Y	Y	0	15	11	11	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M24	080C050002600	15959	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	25,077	0.58	Mobile home park	1946	Y	Y	12	29	22	10	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M25	080C050002700	15965	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	22,500	0.52	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1940	Y	Y	11	26	19	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M26	080C050002800	15995	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	4,297	0.10	One story store	1949	Y	Y	0	5	4	4	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
TOTAL - ASHLAND													81	707	530	449			

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH1	414 002609801	694	Hampton Rd	R-S	SU	8.71	28,320	0.65	Res,Multi,2-4 Single Family Homes		Y	Y	2	6	4	2	Within 50 feet of a flood zone	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH2	429 001004100	310	Cherry Way	R-S	SU	8.71	19,957	0.46	Res,Single Family Residence	1940	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH7	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH3	429 001400700	303	Medford Ave	R-S	SU	8.71	24,412	0.56	Res,Single Family Residence	1926	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential with CH4	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH4	429 001400802	323	Medford Ave	R-S	SU	8.71	37,757	0.87	Res,Multi,2-4 Single Family Homes	1957	Y	N	2	8	6	4	Merger potential with CH3	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH5	429 001403300	350	Cherry Way	R-S	SU	8.71	19,923	0.46	Res,Single Family Residence	1948	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH6	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH6	429 001403400	342	Cherry Way	R-S	SU	8.71	19,849	0.46	Res,Single Family Residence	1947	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH5	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH7	429 001403700	316	Cherry Way	R-S	SU	8.71	19,660	0.45	Res,Single Family Residence	1952	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH2	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH8	429 001903500	567	Cherry Way	R-S	SU	8.71	27,823	0.64	Res,Multi,2-4 Single Family Homes	2005	Y	N	1	6	4	3		Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH9	429 001904000	21065	Western Blvd	R-S	SU	8.71	17,130	0.39	Res,Single Family Residence	1940	Y	N	1	3	3	2		Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH10	429 006402402	227	Willow Ave	R-S	D-35	12.45	16,682	0.38	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		Y	N	0	5	4	4		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH11	414 007609300	770	Grove Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	17,811	0.41	Res,Single Family Residence	1924	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential CH11-14	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH12	414 007609400	752	Grove Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	20,366	0.47	Res,Multi,2-4 Single Family Homes		Y	N	2	6	4	2	Merger potential CH11-14	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH13	414 007609500	730	Grove Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	19,848	0.46	Res,Single Family Residence	1920	Y	N	1	6	4	3	Merger potential CH11-14	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH14	414 007609600	710	Grove Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	19,465	0.45	Res,Single Family Residence	1925	Y	N	1	6	4	3	Merger potential CH11-14	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH15	429 001006100	140	Blossom Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	19,771	0.45	Res,Single Family Residence	1937	Y	N	2	6	4	2	Merger potential CH24 and 25	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH16	429 001408700	296	Blossom Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	21,775	0.50	Res,Single Family Residence	1942	Y	N	1	6	5	4		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH17	429 002302000	396	Grove Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	19,215	0.44	Res,Single Family Residence	1928	Y	N	1	5	4	3		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation	
CH18	431 001607500	22472	Meekland Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	8,264	0.19	Restaurant		Y	N	0	2	2	2		Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential	
CH19	429 000502100	19635	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	19,467	0.45	Res, Single Family Residence	1950	Y	N	1	6	5	4		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential	
CH20	429 001002300	19350	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	10,260	0.24	Industrial	1918	Y	N	1	3	3	2	Industrial uses, adjacent residential, potential RDA site	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential	
CH21	429 001002400	19356	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	7,925	0.18	Industrial	1946	Y	N	0	3	2	2	Industrial uses, adjacent residential, potential RDA site	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential	
CH22	429 001005800	19870	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	13,287	0.31	Res, Single Family Residence	1939	Y	N	1	4	3	2	23	Merger potential with CH15 and 23	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH23	429 001006000	126	Blossom Way	R-S	D-3	14.52	19,761	0.45	Res, Single Family Residence	1937	Y	N	1	7	5	4	22	Merger potential with CH15 and 22	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH24	429 003200200	20337	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	15,983	0.37	Res, Single Family Residence	1943	Y	N	1	5	4	3		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential	
CH25	429 003200400	20449	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	15,744	0.36	Res, Single Family Residence	1953	Y	N	1	5	4	3	3	Merger Potential CH 25-28	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH26	429 003200500	20555	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	15,833	0.36	Res, Single Family Residence	1955	Y	N	1	5	4	3	3	Merger Potential CH 25-28	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH27	429 003200600	20661	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	16,444	0.38	Res, Single Family Residence	1943	Y	N	1	5	4	3	3	Merger Potential CH 25-28	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH28	429 003200700	20667	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	15,868	0.36	Res, Single Family Residence	1943	Y	N	1	5	4	3	3	Merger Potential CH 25-28	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH29	429 003200901		Meekland Av	R-S	D-3	14.52	8,578	0.20	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1975	Y	N	0	3	2	2	2	Merger potential with CH30	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH30	429 003201000	20987	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	14,282	0.33	Res, Single Family Residence		Y	N	1	5	4	3	3	Merger potential with CH29	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH31	414 005102804		Locust St	R-S	DV	12.45	14,400	0.33	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		Y	Y	0	4	3	3	3	Vacant State/County property, approximate lot size, Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Merger potential with CH32	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH32	414 005103002		Foothill Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	20,576	0.47	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		Y	Y	0	10	8	8	Vacant State/County property, approximate lot size, Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Merger potential with CH31	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH33	414 005104800	20922	Locust St	R-S	DV	21.78	22,293	0.51	Single Family Residence	1910	Y	Y	1	11	8	7	Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Merger potential with CH34	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH34	414 005104900	20914	Locust St	R-S	DV	12.45	7,504	0.17	Single Family Residence	1925	Y	Y	1	2	2	1	Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Merger potential with CH33	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH35	414 008605700	21438	Locust St	R-S	DV	12.45	7,500	0.17	One story Commercial		Y	Y	0	2	2	2	Alquist-Priolo Study Area	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH36	414 008606300	21358	Locust St	R-S	DV	12.45	13,629	0.31	Multi-Family Residential, 2-4 SFRs	1900	Y	Y	1	4	3	2	Alquist-Priolo Study Area	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH37	429 005501404	410	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	14,300	0.33	Single family residential homes used as such	1938	Y	N	1	4	3	2		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH38	429 005501700	384	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	17,800	0.41	Single family residential homes used as such	1947	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential with CH39 and 43	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH39	429 005501900	360	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	18,450	0.42	Single family residential homes used as such	1934	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential with CH38 and 43	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH40	429 005502200	318	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	15,000	0.34	Single family residential homes used as such	1948	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential CH40-42	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH41	429 005502800	21836	Princeton St	R-S	DV	21.78	20,000	0.46	Two, three or four single family homes	1943	Y	N	4	10	8	4	Merger potential CH40-42	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH42	429 005502900	21806	Princeton St	R-S	DV	12.45	18,200	0.42	Single family residential homes used as such	1930	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential CH40-42	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH43	429 005505100	366	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	30,945	0.71	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1974	Y	N	8	15	12	4	Merger potential with CH38 and 39	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH44	429 005902100	21823	Princeton St	R-S	DV	12.45	12,320	0.28	Single family residential homes used as such	1950	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH45	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH45	429 005902202	21837	Princeton St	R-S	DV	12.45	15,800	0.36	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1963	Y	N	1	5	3	2	Merger potential with CH44	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH46	429 006403502	122	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	20,860	0.48	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1947	Y	N	1	10	8	7	Merger potential with CH47	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH47	429 006403600	130	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	19,100	0.44	Warehouse		Y	N	0	10	7	7	Need to survey to verify lot size. Merger potential with CH46	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH48	429 006403800	148	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	12,850	0.29	Single family residential homes used as such	1928	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH49	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH49	429 006403900	152	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	16,600	0.38	Single family residential homes used as such	1932	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential with CH48	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH50	429 006404700	145	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	17,370	0.40	Single family residential homes used as such	1923	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential with CH51	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH51	429 006405402	22008	Meekland Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	44,431	1.02	Miscellaneous improved commercial		Y	N	0	22	17	17	Merger potential with CH50	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH52	429 008602501	155	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	13,818	0.32	Single family residential homes used as such	1925	Y	N	1	4	3	2		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH53	429 009102602	254	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	11,349	0.26	Two, three or four single family homes	1938	Y	N	0	3	2	2	Merger potential with CH54	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH54	429 009102700	248	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	16,200	0.37	Single family residential homes used as such	1923	Y	N	1	5	3	2	Merger potential with CH53	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH55	429 009104103	243	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	24,697	0.57	Single family residential homes used as such	1930	Y	N	2	12	9	7	Merger potential with CH61	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH56	429 009104400	263	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	12,300	0.28	Two, three or four single family homes	1928	Y	N	1	4	3	2		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH57	429 009105600	256	Laurel Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	22,200	0.51	Residential property converted to 5 or more units	1943	Y	N	6	11	8	2		Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH58	429 009106500	164	Laurel Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	12,349	0.28	Two, three or four single family homes	1926	Y	N	1	4	3	2		Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH59	429 009107300	171	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	12,350	0.28	Triplex; double or duplex with single family home	1948	Y	N	1	4	3	2		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH60	429 009107600	177	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	12,350	0.28	Two, three or four single family homes	1927	Y	N	1	4	3	2		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH61	429 009109900	247	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	8,645	0.20	Single family residential homes used as such	1984	Y	N	0	2	2	2	Merger potential with CH55	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH62	431 001200600	337	Laurel Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	22,233	0.51	Residential property converted to 5 or more units		Y	N	6	11	8	2	Merger potential CH62-64	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH63	431 001202100	324	Smalley Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,448	0.47	Two, three or four single family homes	1952	Y	N	2	10	8	6	Merger potential CH62-64	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH64	431 001202200	346	Smalley Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,448	0.47	Res., Multiple Family	1956	Y	N	3	10	8	5	Merger potential CH62-64	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH65	431 001202600	368	Smalley Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	22,233	0.51	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1988	Y	N	5	11	8	3		Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH66	431 001600500	169	Laurel Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	11,928	0.27	Single family residential homes used as such	1926	Y	N	1	3	3	2		Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH67	431 001601001	207	Laurel Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	23,928	0.55	Single family residential homes used as such	1920	Y	N	1	12	9	8		Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH68	431 001601400	261	Laurel Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,448	0.47	Res., Multiple Family	1952	Y	N	4	10	8	4	Merger potential CH68 and 69	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH69	431 001601500	275	Laurel Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,448	0.47	Four living units; e.g. fourplex or triplex w/SFR	1965	Y	N	4	10	8	4	Merger potential CH68 and 69	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH70	431 001603600	204	Smalley Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	20,448	0.47	Two, three or four single family homes	1961	Y	N	2	6	4	2		Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH71	431 001604500	22358	Meekland Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	10,359	0.24	One to five story office building		Y	N	0	3	2	2		Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH72	431 001605200	159	Smalley Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	19,400	0.45	Church		Y	N	0	10	7	7	Boundary adjustment to meet RS-D20 requirement	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH73	414 005602101	21030	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	14,820	0.34	One story store	1953	Y	Y	0	17	13	13	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH74	414 005602301	21050	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	9,693	0.22	Commercial repair garage	1957	Y	Y	0	11	8	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH75	414 008100101	21070	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	9,250	0.21	Single family residential homes used as such	1923	Y	Y	1	11	8	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH76	414 008100200	21098	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	7,903	0.18	Vacant commercial land (may include misc. imps)		Y	Y	1	9	7	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH77	414 008100300	21106	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	10,987	0.25	One story store	1966	Y	Y	0	13	9	9	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH78	414 008100400	21120	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	7,405	0.17	One story store	1951	Y	Y	0	9	6	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH79	414 008100500	21144	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	29,625	0.68	One to five story office building	1960	Y	Y	0	34	27	27	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH80	414 008100600	21172	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	24,169	0.55	Motel	1955	Y	Y	0	28	21	21	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH81	414 008100700	21180	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	13,470	0.31	Parking lot		Y	Y	0	15	12	12	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH82	414 008100800	21222	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	16,475	0.38	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1946	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH83	414 008100900	21286	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	9,861	0.23	One to five story office building	1926	Y	Y	0	11	8	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH84	414 008101000	21288	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	9,633	0.22	Single family residential homes used as such	1926	Y	Y	1	11	8	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation		
CH85	414 008101100	21308	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,712	0.20	One to five story office building	1953	Y	Y	2	10	8	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH86	414 008101200	21328	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,276	0.19	One to five story office building		Y	Y	0	10	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH87	414 008101300	21344	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,650	0.20	One to five story office building	1940	Y	Y	0	10	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH88	414 008101400	21366	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,300	0.19	Residential Imps on Commercial Land	1928	Y	Y	1	10	7	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH89	414 008101500	21376	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,775	0.18	One story store	1942	Y	Y	0	9	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH90	414 008101600	21380	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,300	0.17	Triplex; double or duplex with single family home	1941	Y	Y	3	8	6	3	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH91	414 008101700	21390	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,759	0.16	Two, three or four single family homes	1940	Y	Y	2	8	6	4	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
TOTAL - CHERRYLAND													109	694	522	413					

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V1	085 530000904	5349	Crow Canyon Rd	P-D		2.18	155,117	3.56	Rur,Rural,Changing To Higher Use	1952	N	Y	0	8	6	6	Within 50 feet of a creek	Castro Valley/Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V2	084D116501500	18133	Lamson Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	54,450	1.25	Res,Single Family Residence		N	N	1	5	4	3		Castro Valley/Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V3	084D117300300	18724	Lamson Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	44,867	1.03	Res,Single Family With Second Unit	2000	N	N	1	4	3	2		Castro Valley/Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V4	084D116800800	18791	Lamson Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	35,284	0.81	Res,Single Family Residence	1946	N	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with V4, V5, V7 and V8	Castro Valley/Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V5	084D116802404	18880	Walnut Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	29,621	0.68	Res,Single Family Residence	1948	N	N	1	3	2	1	Merger potential with V4, V5, V7 and V8	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V6	084C088503304			R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	19,166	0.44	Vacant		N	N	0	2	1	1		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V7	084D116801000	18837	Lamson Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	46,174	1.06	Res,Single Family Residence	1950	N	N	1	5	3	2	Merger potential with V4, V5, V7 and V8	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V8	084D116802300	18886	Walnut Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	46,174	1.06	Res,Single Family Residence	1946	N	N	1	5	3	2	Merger potential with V4, V5, V7 and V8	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V9	084C090501800	18471	Apricot Way	R-1	CSU-RV	6.22	43,560	1.00	Res,Multi,2-4 Single Family Homes	1940	N	N	3	6	5	2		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V10	084C086000404	5067	Seaview Ave	R-1	CSU-RV	6.22	56,628	1.30	Res,Single Family Residence	1954	N	N	1	8	6	5		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V11	084C090505100	4652	Malabar Ave	R-1	CSU-RV	6.22	32,670	0.75	Res,Single Family Residence	1946	N	N	1	5	3	2		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V12	084C084001002	18534	Pepper St	R-1	CSU-RV	6.22	16,117	0.37	Res,Single Family Residence	1930	N	N	1	2	2	1		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V13	084A025000904	20396	John Dr	R-1	CSU-RV	6.22	69,260	1.59	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	10	7	7	Merger potential with V13	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V14	084A025000903	20338	John Dr	R-1	CSU	6.22	130,244	2.99	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1906	N	N	0	19	14	14	Merger potential with V14	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V15	084D118000204	4619	Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	47,480	1.09	Res,Single Family Residence	1948	N	N	1	7	5	4		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V16	084D118002800	4635	Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	19,672	0.45	Res,Multi,2-4 Units,Boarding Use	1946	N	N	1	3	2	1	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V17	084D118000400	4643	Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	24,394	0.56	Res,Single Family Residence	1955	N	N	1	3	3	2	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential
V18	084D118000500	4651	Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	35,284	0.81	Res,Single Family Residence	1946	N	N	1	5	4	3	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Desnity Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V19	084D118000700	4659	Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	58,806	1.35	Res, Single Family Residence	1948	N	N	1	8	6	5	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V20	084D118000800		Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	84,942	1.95	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	12	9	9	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V21	084D110000116		Brookdale Bl	R-1	CSU-RV	6.22	57,935	1.33	Vacant, Public Agencies, Exempt		N	N	0	8	6	6		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V22	084D118000600		Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	23,244	0.53	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	3	2	2	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V23	084D118502200	4800	Sorani Way	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	29,621	0.68	Res, Single Family Residence	1973	N	N	1	4	3	2	Possible merger with V23-V25	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V24	084D119000405	4806	Sorani Way	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	25,265	0.58	Res, Single Family Residence	1973	N	N	1	4	3	2	Possible merger with V23-V25	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V25	084D119000502		Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	24,394	0.56	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	3	3	3	Possible merger with V23-V25	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V26	084C063001109	3889	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	17.45	11,326	0.26	Service Stations	1964	Y	N	0	5	3	3	Possible to merge with V43 and V42	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V27	084C066100606	3970	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	17.45	104,544	2.40	Mobile home park	1984	Y	N	49	42	31	-18	49 unit mobile home site, higher density may be allowed subject to specific plan guidelines.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V28	415 016000100	21112	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	10,484	0.24	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	5	4	4	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 -V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V29	415 016000200	21120	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	9,740	0.22	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	5	4	4	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 -V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V30	415 016000300	21128	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	8,935	0.21	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 -V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V31	415 016000400	21134	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	8,373	0.19	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 -V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V32	415 016000500	21144	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	8,006	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 -V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V33	415 023001100	22447	Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	7,500	0.17	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	1	4	3	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V34	415 023001200	22459	Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	7,500	0.17	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	1	4	3	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V35	415 023001300		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	14,363	0.33	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	7	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V36	415 023001600	22513	Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	6,481	0.15	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	3	2	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V37	415 023001700		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	7,470	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V38	415 023001900		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	8,295	0.19	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V39	415 023002100	1432	A St	R-S	D-20	21.78	7,500	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V40	415 023002200	1424	A St	R-S	D-20	21.78	6,416	0.15	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	3	2	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V41	415 016002600	21457	Gary Dr	R-1	CSU-RV	21.78	8,450	0.19	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	1	4	3	2	State Property, 238 Study area, Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V42	084C063000606	3937	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	95,396	2.19	Misc. industrial (improved); no other ind code	1998	Y	N	24	48	36	12	Mobile homes in the rear of property. Possible to merger with V26 and V43	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V43	084C063001117	3913	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	233,046	5.35	Mobile home park	1958	Y	N	94	117	87	-7	94 unit mobile home site, higher density may be allowed subject to specific plan guidelines. Possible to merge with V26 and V42	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V44	084C065000505	4026	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	53,100	1.22	Single family residential homes used as such	1956	N	N	1	27	20	19	Possible to merge with V59	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V45	084C065000204	4096	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	17,424	0.40	Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	9	7	7	Possible to merge with V46	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V46	084C065000100	21195	Center St	CVCBD	S10	21.78	54,450	1.25	Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	27	20	20	Possible to merge with V45	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V47	415 023001400		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	51,400	1.18	Pub,Public Agencies, Exempt		N	Y	0	26	19	19	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V48	415 023001500		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	6,554	0.15	Pub,Public Agencies, Exempt		N	Y	0	3	2	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V49	084A006001402			CVCBD	S08	30.00	24,829	0.57	BART parking lot		Y	N	0	17	13	13		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V50	415 016001100	21320	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,795	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V50 and V51	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V51	415 016001200	21338	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,466	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V50 and V51	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V52	415 016001400	21406	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,530	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V53	415 016001500	21420	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,758	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V54	415 016001600	21408	Oak St	R-4		34.85	6,917	0.16	Residential building of 2 or more units, Public Agencies, Exempt		N	N	2	6	4	2	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V55	415 016001800	21454	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,426	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V56	415 016001900	21462	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,405	0.17	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt	1940	N	N	1	6	4	3	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V57	415 016002000	21484	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,330	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V58	084C065000611	21767	Center St	CVCBD	S10	40.00	19,602	0.45	Vacant residential land, zoned 4 units or less		N	N	0	18	14	14		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation		
V59	415 021005001	1452	Crescent Ave.	R-S	D-15	29.04	70567	1.62	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	47	35	35	State Property, 238 Study area	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.		
V60	415 018006801		Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	68825	1.58	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	46	34	34	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.		
V61	415 018006901		Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	129373	2.97	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	86	65	65	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.		
V62	415 018007300	1459	Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	35247	0.81	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	1	24	18	17	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.		
													194	794	596	402					

TOTAL - CASTRO VALLEY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
F1	417 011006300	22502	Woodroe Ave	R-1		6.00	134,944	3.10	Ins.Schools	1954	N	N	0	19	14	14		Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F2	417 008000504	22505	Woodroe Ave	R-1		6.00	40,605	0.93	Res,Sgl Family With Commercial Use	1976	N	N	2	6	4	2		Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F3	417 019006500	23031	Henry Ln	R-1		6.00	20,970	0.48	Res,Single Family Residence	1925	N	N	1	3	2	1	Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F4	417 019006600	23039	Henry Ln	R-1		6.00	22,455	0.52	Res,Single Family Residence	1950	N	N	1	3	2	1	Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F5	417 019010300	23047	Henry Ln	R-1		6.00	20,502	0.47	Res,Single Family Residence		N	N	1	3	2	1	23047 Henry lane parcels were merged in 2008. Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F6	417 019010400	23047	Henry Ln	R-1					Vacant		N	N	0			0	Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F7	417 019006800	23063	Henry Ln	R-1		6.00	16,787	0.39	Res,Single Family Residence	1954	N	N	1	2	2	1	Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
F8	417 006007100	2700	Kelly St	R-1		6.00	29,374	0.67	Res,Single Family Residence	1947	N	Y	1	4	3	2	Within 50 feet of a creek. Lot merger potential F8 to F11	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F9	417 006007000	2658	Kelly St	R-1		6.00	19,744	0.45	Res,Single Family Residence	1928	N	Y	1	3	2	1	Within 50 feet of a creek. Lot merger potential F8 to F11	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F10	417 006007600	2600	Kelly St	R-1		6.00	26,203	0.60	Res,Single Family Residence	1979	N	Y	1	4	3	2	Within 50 feet of a creek. Lot merger potential F8 to F11	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F11	417 006007700	2598	Kelly St	R-1		6.00	53,444	1.23	Res,Single Family Residence	1922	N	N	1	7	6	5	Lot merger potential F8 to F11	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F12	417 021000500	2931	Kelly St	R-1		6.00	20,657	0.47	Res,Single Family Residence	1946	N	N	1	3	2	1		Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F13	417 021000700	2921	Kelly St	R-1		6.00	20,020	0.46	Res,Single Family Residence	1951	N	N	1	3	2	1		Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F14	416 018006200	22866	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	14,224	0.33	Res,Single Family Residence	1954	N	N	1	2	1	0	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F15	416 018006100	22866	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	17,832	0.41	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	2	2	2	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F16	416 018000100		Mansfield Av	R-1		6.00	60,171	1.38	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	8	6	6	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F17	416 020000200	23000	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	37,563	0.86	Res,Single Family Residence	1979	N	N	1	5	4	3	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F18	416 020000100	23093	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	87,875	2.02	Res,Single Family Residence	1975	N	N	1	12	9	8	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
F19	416 020000300	23090	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	30,369	0.70	Res, Single Family Residence	1944	N	N	1	4	3	2	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F20	416 020000400	23098	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	60,370	1.39	Res, Single Family Residence	1927	N	N	1	8	6	5	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F21	417 022001201	3216	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	106,860	2.45	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1937	N	N	1	9	6	5	Possible to merge F21, F23, F25, F26 and F28	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F22	417 022004100	23572	Maud Ave	R-1		5.00	27,660	0.63	Res, Single Family Residence	1948	N	N	1	3	2	1		Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F23	417 022001104	3230	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	44,744	1.03	Res, Single Family Residence	1960	N	N	1	4	3	2	Possible to merge F21, F23, F25, F26 and F28	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F24	417 024001204	3289	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	81,458	1.87	Res, Single Family Residence		N	N	1	7	5	4	Possible o merge F24 and F29	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F25	417 022002500	23756	Maud Ave	R-1		6.00	24,015	0.55	Res, Single Family Residence	1953	N	N	1	3	2	1	Possible to merge F21, F23, F25, F26 and F28	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F26	417 022002400	23790	Maud Ave	R-1		6.00	32,464	0.75	Res, Single Family Residence	1927	N	N	1	4	3	2	Possible to merge F21, F23, F25, F26 and F28	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F27	417 024000100	3247	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	130,644	3.00	Res, Single Family Residence	1925	N	N	1	10	8	7	Possible to merge F27 and F30	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F28	417 022002200	23830	Maud Ave	R-1		6.00	24,239	0.56	Res, Single Family Residence	1960	N	N	1	3	3	2	Possible to merge F21, F23, F25, F26 and F28	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F29	417 024000500	3291	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	82,880	1.90	Res, Single Family Residence	1877	N	N	1	7	5	4	Possible o merge F24 and F29	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F30	417 025000100	3231	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	35,399	0.81	Res, Single Family Residence	1953	N	N	1	3	2	1	Possible to merge F27 and F30	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F31	417 026000400		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	3.50	330,441	7.59	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	27	20	20	Possible to merge F31 and F32 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F32	417 026000500		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	3.50	531,419	12.20	Pub, Owned By Public Utility		N	N	0	43	32	32	Possible to merge F31 and F32 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
F33	425 001000202	24717	Fairview Ave	R-1	B-E	2.18	156,083	3.58	Res, Single Family Residence	1940	N	N	1	8	6	5		Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 20,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F34	426 004002000	2663	Hidden Ln	R-1	B-E	3.50	256,782	5.89	Res, Multi, 2-4 Single Family Homes	1951	N	Y	2	21	15	13	Within 50 feet of a creek	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F35	426 010001000	1665	E St	R-1	B-E	5.00	34,060	0.78	Res, Single Family Residence		N	N	1	4	3	2		Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F36	425 002000507		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	2.18	246,723	5.66	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1951	N	N	0	12	9	9	Possible to merge F36 and F41 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 20,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F37	426 010000600	1653	E St	R-1	B-E	5.00	42,930	0.99	Res, Single Family Residence	1951	N	N	1	5	4	3		Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F38	426 010000300	1615	E St	R-1	B-E	5.00	28,121	0.65	Res, Single Family Residence	1925	N	N	1	3	2	1		Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F39	426 012000800	1989	E St	R-1	B-E	5.00	65,268	1.50	Res, Single Family Residence		N	N	1	7	6	5		Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F40	426 012002200	2141	E St	R-1	B-E	5.00	70,451	1.62	Res, Multi, 2 Units		N	N	2	8	6	4		Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F41	425 002000304	24867	Fairview Ave	R-1	B-E	2.18	181,220	4.16	Res, Single Family Residence	1912	N	N	1	9	7	6	Possible to merge F36 and F41 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 20,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F42	426 018001200	1859	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	29,376	0.67	Res, Single Family Residence	1975	N	Y	1	3	3	2	Within 50 feet of a creek. May be possible to merge F42 to F46 and F51 to create a single larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F43	426 017000100	1875	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	52,858	1.21	Res, Single Family Residence	1930	N	Y	1	6	5	4	Within 50 feet of a creek. May be possible to merge F42 to F46 and F51 to create a single larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F44	426 017000300	1907	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	76,857	1.76	Res, Single Family Residence	1951	N	Y	1	9	7	6	Within 50 feet of a creek. May be possible to merge F42 to F46 and F51 to create a single larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F45	426 017000400	1921	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	52,460	1.20	Res, Single Family Residence	1964	N	Y	1	6	5	4	Within 50 feet of a creek. May be possible to merge F42 to F46 and F51 to create a single larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation		
F46	426 017005100	1947	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	50,094	1.15	Res, Single Family Residence		N	N	1	6	4	3	Within 50 feet of a creek. May be possible to merge F42 to F46 and F51 to create a single larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA		
F47	426 017000900		East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	39,894	0.92	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1960	N	Y	0	5	3	3	Within 50 feet of a creek . Adjacent to F50, possible to merge.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA		
F48	426 016000100	2085	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	52,114	1.20	Res, Single Family Residence	1962	N	Y	1	6	4	3	Within 50 feet of a creek . Adjacent to F49, possible to merge.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA		
F49	426 016000300	2091	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	24,950	0.57	Res, Single Family Residence		N	Y	1	3	2	1	Within 50 feet of a creek . Adjacent to F48, possible to merge.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA		
F50	426 017001300		East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	47,167	1.08	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	Y	0	5	4	4	Within 50 feet of a creek . Adjacent to F47, possible to merge.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA		
F51	426 017007300	24380	Peterson Ct	R-1	B-E	5.00	19,577	0.45	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1947	N	Y	0	2	2	2	Within 50 feet of a creek	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA		
F52	426 017002000	24696	2nd St	R-1	B-E	5.00	44,916	1.03	Res, Single Family Residence		N	Y	1	5	4	3	Within 50 feet of a creek	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA		
TOTAL - FAIRVIEW													45	357	268	223					

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
HA1	412 008707800	705	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	14,534	0.33	Single Family Residence	1922	Y	N	1	4	3	2		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA2	412 009501401	441	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	13,054	0.30	Single family residential homes used as such	1930	Y	N	1	4	3	2		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA3	412 009501700	509	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	26,862	0.62	Four living units; e.g. fourplex or triplex w/SFR	1953	Y	N	4	13	10	6	Lots HA3 through HA7 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA4	412 009501800	513	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	40,560	0.93	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1959	Y	N	11	20	15	4	Lots HA3 through HA7 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
HA5	412 009501900	533	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	23,877	0.55	Single family res home with non-economic 2nd unit	1941	Y	N	2	12	9	7	Lots HA3 through HA7 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA6	412 009502000	553	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	16,808	0.39	Single family residential homes used as such	1942	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Lots HA3 through HA7 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA7	412 009502100	573	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	43,560	1.00	Church	1962	Y	N	1	22	16	15	Lots HA3 through HA7 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA8	429 006800300	21271	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	35,000	0.80	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1967	Y	N	8	18	13	5	Lots HA8 through HA10 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA9	429 006800501	21341	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	21,000	0.48	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1966	Y	N	6	11	8	2	Lots HA8 through HA10 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA10	429 006800900	265	Flint Ct	R-S	DV	21.78	50,000	1.15	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1962	Y	N	6	25	19	13	Lots HA8 through HA10 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA11	429 006802100	21727	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,000	0.46	Residential property converted to 5 or more units	1964	Y	N	5	10	8	3		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA12	429 007300300	21855	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	31,200	0.72	Single family residential homes used as such	1905	Y	N	1	16	12	11		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA13	429 007304100	22029	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	23,800	0.55	Single family residential homes used as such	1914	Y	N	1	12	9	8		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA14	429 007700400	22123	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	15,000	0.34	Single family residential homes used as such	1940	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Lots HA14 and 15 adjacent, possible to merge	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA15	429 007700500	22147	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	15,000	0.34	Single family residential homes used as such	1920	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Lots HA14 and 15 adjacent, possible to merge	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA16	432 000401302	755	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	7,275	0.17	Multi-family Residential 2 units	1993	Y	N	0	2	2	2	Lots HA16 through HA19 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
HA17	432 000401402	759	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	53,572	1.23	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1957	Y	N	13	27	20	7	Lots HA16 through HA19 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA18	432 000401504	781	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	31,463	0.72	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1970	Y	N	9	16	12	3	Lots HA16 through HA19 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA19	432 000403604	704	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	35,500	0.81	Multi-Family Residential, converted to five or more units	1954	Y	N	11	18	13	2	Lots HA16 through HA19 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA20	432 000404600	19700	Hesperial Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	63,599	1.46	Hospital	1968	Y	N	0	32	24	24		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA21	432 000800100	409	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	27,000	0.62	Light industrial	1956	Y	N	2	14	10	8	Possible to merger HA21 and HA22. Could also merge with 310 Bartlett	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA22	432 000800400	441	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	37,750	0.87	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1955	Y	N	10	19	14	4	Possible to merger HA21 and HA22. Could also merge with 310 Bartlett	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA23	432 000800600	463	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	40,837	0.94	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1960	Y	N	11	20	15	4	Possible to merge with 370 Bartlett	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA24	432 000801806	370	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	40,838	0.94	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1964	Y	N	12	20	15	3	Possible to merge with 463 W Sunset	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA25	432 000802100	310	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	25,160	0.58	Misc. industrial (improved); no other ind code	1920	Y	N	1	13	9	8	Could combine with 441 and 409 Sunset	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA26	432 000802400	20555	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,347	0.47	Two, three or four single family homes	1924	Y	N	2	10	8	6	Sites HA 26 through 30 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA27	432 000802500	20563	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	22,000	0.51	Five or more single family res homes	1953	Y	N	6	11	8	2	Sites HA 26 through 30 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
HA28	432 000802602	20625	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	24,680	0.57	Four living units; e.g. fourplex or triplex w/SFR	1963	Y	N	4	12	9	5	Sites HA 26 through 30 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA29	432 000802802	20789	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	36,896	0.85	Church	1972	Y	N	1	18	14	13	Sites HA 26 through 30 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA30	432 000803400	571	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	16,870	0.39	Two, three or four single family homes	1925	Y	N	2	5	4	2	Sites HA 26 through 30 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA31	432 000803703	482	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	10,416	0.24	Triplex; double or duplex with single family home	1964	Y	N	0	3	2	2		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA32	432 000804100	330	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	43,000	0.99	Res., Condominium	1962	Y	N	9	22	16	7		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA33	432 001200100	410	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	41,022	0.94	Single family residential homes used as such	1942	Y	N	1	21	15	14	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA34	432 001200902	21132	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	13,824	0.32	Single family residential homes used as such	1938	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA35	432 001201004	21164	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	29,417	0.68	Double or duplex type - two units	1945	Y	N	2	15	11	9	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
HA36	432 001201103	21190	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	59,422	1.36	Res., Multiple Family	1963	Y	N	18	30	22	4	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA37	432 001201302	21266	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,350	0.47	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1960	Y	N	5	10	8	3	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA38	432 001201502	21338	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	30,238	0.69	Residential property converted to 5 or more units	1945	Y	N	7	15	11	4	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA39	432 001202500	387	Lupine Way	R-S	DV	21.78	41,818	0.96	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1960	Y	N	10	21	16	6	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA40	432 001601603	21155	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	24,867	0.57	Multi-Family Residential, 2-4 SFRs	1924	Y	N	3	12	9	6		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA41	432 001601700	21233	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,500	0.47	Multi-family Residential 3 units	1963	Y	N	3	10	8	5	Possible to merge HA41 to HA43.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA42	432 001601800	21247	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	41,000	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more SFRs	1946	Y	N	5	21	15	10	Possible to merge HA41 to HA43.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA43	432 001602000	21335	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	37,000	0.85	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1953	Y	N	11	19	14	3	Possible to merge HA41 to HA43.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA44	432 001602402	21631	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	40,760	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1965	Y	N	12	20	15	3		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA45	432 001603802	21134	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	41,060	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1956	Y	N	11	21	15	4	Possible to merge HA45 to HA48.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation		
HA46	432 001604102	20962	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	40,760	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1958	Y	N	11	20	15	4	Possible to merge HA45 to HA48.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA47	432 001604202	20930	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	40,760	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, converted to five or more units	1959	Y	N	11	20	15	4	Possible to merge HA45 to HA48.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA48	432 001606600	21064	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	52,141	1.20	Multi-Family, Condominium		Y	N	17	26	20	3	Possible to merge HA45 to HA48.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA49	432 002000300	20913	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	110,000	2.53	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1960	Y	N	24	55	41	17	Next to 21031 Royal	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA50	432 002000400	21031	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,500	0.47	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1939	Y	N	6	10	8	2	Next to 20913 Royal	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA51	432 002000600	21135	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	14,364	0.33	Single Family Residence	1935	Y	N	1	4	3	2		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA52	432 002002816	897	W A St	R-S	DV	21.78	35,667	0.82	Industrial	1980	Y	N	0	18	13	13		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA53	432 002003100	878	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	20,250	0.46	Multi-Family Residential, converted to five or more units	1959	Y	N	5	10	8	3		Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA54	432 002003402	830	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	41,000	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units		Y	N	12	21	15	3	Lot configuration suggests potential to merge lots HA54 to HA57.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA55	432 002003500	806	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	41,060	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, converted to five or more units	1948	Y	N	5	21	15	10	Lot configuration suggests potential to merge lots HA54 to HA57.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA56	432 002003602	790	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	40,760	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1961	Y	N	11	20	15	4	Lot configuration suggests potential to merge lots HA54 to HA57.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
HA57	432 002003702	766	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	44,300	1.02	Multi-Family Residential, converted to five or more units	1965	Y	N	9	22	17	8	Lot configuration suggests potential to merge lots HA54 to HA57.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential		
TOTAL - HAYWARD ACRES													315	906	679	335					

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z1	411 006301700	1210 and 1294	Bockman Rd	PD-2209		21.78	168,627	3.87	Vacant Commercial		Y	N	28	84	81	53	Approved for 81 units residential and some commercial use per PD-2209	San Lorenzo/Eden	Medium and High Density Residential
Z2	412 003400205	15800	Hesperian Blvd.	C2		19.66	265,716	6.10	Shopping Center	1978	Y	N	0	120	90	90	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z3	412 003400607	15820	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	182,952	4.20	Shopping Center	1978	Y	N	0	83	62	62	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z4	412 003400606	15858	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	21,780	0.50	Shopping Center	1971	Y	N	0	10	7	7	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z5	412 003400908	15888	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	39,204	0.90	One story store	1963	Y	N	0	18	13	13	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z6	412 003400809	15888	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	26,136	0.60	Shopping Center		Y	N	0	12	9	9	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z7	412 003400807	15888	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	21,780	0.50	Service Stations	1969	Y	N	0	10	7	7	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z8	412 003400906	15890	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	30,492	0.70	Shopping Center	1954	Y	N	0	14	10	10	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z9	412 003401102	15918	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	60,984	1.40	Shopping Center	1954	Y	N	0	28	21	21	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z10	412 003401307	15960	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	17,424	0.40	Shopping Center	1980	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z11	412 003401309	429	Paseo Grande	C1		19.66	13,939	0.32	Shopping Center	1983	Y	Y	0	6	5	5	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z12	412 003109300	587	Paseo Grande	C1		19.66	26,136	0.60	Vacant commercial land (may include misc. imps)		Y	Y	0	12	9	9	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5A
Z13	412 003109200	507	Paseo Grande	C1		19.66	74,052	1.70	Shopping Center	1966	Y	Y	0	33	25	25	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5A
Z14	412 003902303	16010	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	16,988	0.39	Bank	1966	Y	Y	0	8	6	6	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 4
Z15	412 003902403	16020	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	41,382	0.95	Shopping Center	1960	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 4
Z16	412 003900103		Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	67,954	1.56	Shopping Center		Y	Y	0	31	23	23	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5B

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation		
Z17	412 004211300	16015	Via Arriba	C1		19.66	71,003	1.63	Shopping Center		Y	Y	0	32	24	24	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5c		
Z18	412 003902600	16090	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	48,787	1.12	Shopping Center	1960	Y	Y	0	22	17	17	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D		
Z19	412 003900402	500	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	10,890	0.25	Shopping Center	1965	Y	Y	0	5	4	4	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D		
Z20	412 003900300	520	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	12,197	0.28	Shopping Center	1965	Y	Y	0	6	4	4	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D		
Z21	412 003900200	550	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	71,438	1.64	Shopping Center	1976	Y	Y	0	32	24	24	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D		
Z22	412 008707102	19390	Hesperian Blvd	R-S	D-25	17.42	42,207	0.97	Com,Store,On e-Story	1931	Y	N	1	17	13	12		San Lorenzo/ Eden	Medium Density Residential		
TOTAL - SAN LORENZO													29	607	473	444					
TOTAL ALL COMMUNITIES													773	4,065	3,068	2,266					

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - HIGH DENSITY PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M9	080D056301700		Dermody Ave	R-3/R-4		30.00	37,897	0.87	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	26	20	20	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M10	080D056502900		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	84,071	1.93	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	58	43	43	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, watercourse near property. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M11	080D056503000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	43,560	1.00	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	30	23	23	Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M12	080D056803000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	65,776	1.51	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	45	34	34	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M13	080D056803100		Wagner St	R-S	D-15	30.00	78,844	1.81	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	54	41	41	Creek/watercourse close to property. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M14	080 005704000	16110	E 14th	ACBD	TA	50.00	55,500	1.27	Retail Sales		Y	N	0	64	48	48	Approved for 48 units	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M15	080C047600100	16035	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,882	0.20	Commercial, Miscellaneous, Improved	1932	Y	N	0	10	8	8	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M16	080C047600200	16039	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,970	0.18	One story store	1947	Y	N	0	9	7	7	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M17	080C047600300	16043	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,390	0.16	Commercial, Miscellaneous, Improved	1930	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M18	080C047600501	16064	Ashland Ave	ACBD	TA	50.00	10,560	0.24	Four living units; e.g. fourplex or triplex w/SFR	1910	Y	N	4	12	9	5	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - HIGH DENSITY PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation		
M19	080C047601101	16151	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,869	0.16	One story store	1942	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential		
M20	080C047601103	16115	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	111,514	2.56	Mobile home park	1950	Y	N	44	128	96	52	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential		
M21	080C049500103	16021	Ashland Ave	ACBD	TA	50.00	81,881	1.88	Warehouse	1991	Y	Y	0	94	70	70	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26.	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential		
M22	080C050002401	15951	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	16,783	0.39	One story store	1981	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential		
M23	080C050002500	15957	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	12,851	0.30	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1960	Y	Y	0	15	11	11	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential		
M24	080C050002600	15959	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	25,077	0.58	Mobile home park	1946	Y	Y	12	29	22	10	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential		
M25	080C050002700	15965	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	22,500	0.52	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1940	Y	Y	11	26	19	8	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential		
M26	080C050002800	15995	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	4,297	0.10	One story store	1949	Y	Y	0	5	4	4	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential		
TOTAL - ASHLAND													71	640	480	409					

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - HIGH DENSITY PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH73	414 005602101	21030	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	14,820	0.34	One story store	1953	Y	Y	0	17	13	13	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH74	414 005602301	21050	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	9,693	0.22	Commercial repair garage	1957	Y	Y	0	11	8	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH75	414 008100101	21070	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	9,250	0.21	Single family residential homes used as such	1923	Y	Y	1	11	8	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH76	414 008100200	21098	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	7,903	0.18	Vacant commercial land (may include misc. imps)		Y	Y	1	9	7	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH77	414 008100300	21106	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	10,987	0.25	One story store	1966	Y	Y	0	13	9	9	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH78	414 008100400	21120	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	7,405	0.17	One story store	1951	Y	Y	0	9	6	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH79	414 008100500	21144	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	29,625	0.68	One to five story office building	1960	Y	Y	0	34	27	27	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH80	414 008100600	21172	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	24,169	0.55	Motel	1955	Y	Y	0	28	21	21	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH81	414 008100700	21180	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	13,470	0.31	Parking lot		Y	Y	0	15	12	12	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - HIGH DENSITY PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation		
CH82	414 008100800	21222	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	16,475	0.38	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1946	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH83	414 008100900	21286	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	9,861	0.23	One to five story office building	1926	Y	Y	0	11	8	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH84	414 008101000	21288	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	9,633	0.22	Single family residential homes used as such	1926	Y	Y	1	11	8	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH85	414 008101100	21308	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,712	0.20	One to five story office building	1953	Y	Y	2	10	8	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH86	414 008101200	21328	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,276	0.19	One to five story office building		Y	Y	0	10	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH87	414 008101300	21344	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,650	0.20	One to five story office building	1940	Y	Y	0	10	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH88	414 008101400	21366	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,300	0.19	Residential Imps on Commercial Land	1928	Y	Y	1	10	7	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH89	414 008101500	21376	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,775	0.18	One story store	1942	Y	Y	0	9	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH90	414 008101600	21380	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,300	0.17	Triplex; double or duplex with single family home	1941	Y	Y	3	8	6	3	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
CH91	414 008101700	21390	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,759	0.16	Two, three or four single family homes	1940	Y	Y	2	8	6	4	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential		
TOTAL - CHERRYLAND													11	251	190	179					

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - HIGH DENSITY PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V50	415 016001100	21320	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,795	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V50 and V51	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V51	415 016001200	21338	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,466	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V50 and V51	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V52	415 016001400	21406	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,530	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V53	415 016001500	21420	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,758	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V54	415 016001600	21408	Oak St	R-4		34.85	6,917	0.16	Residential building of 2 or more units, Public Agencies, Exempt		N	N	2	6	4	2	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V55	415 016001800	21454	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,426	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V56	415 016001900	21462	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,405	0.17	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt	1940	N	N	1	6	4	3	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - HIGH DENSITY PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation		
V57	415 016002000	21484	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,330	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.		
V58	084C065000611	21767	Center St	CVCBD	S10	40.00	19,602	0.45	Vacant residential land, zoned 4 units or less		N	N	0	18	14	14		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential		
V59	415 021005001	1452	Crescent Ave.	R-S	D-15	29.04	70567	1.62	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	47	35	35	State Property, 238 Study area	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.		
V60	415 018006801		Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	68825	1.58	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	46	34	34	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.		
V61	415 018006901		Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	129373	2.97	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	86	65	65	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.		
V62	415 018007300	1459	Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	35247	0.81	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	1	24	18	17	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.		
TOTAL - CASTRO VALLEY													17	528	397	380					

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - MIXED USE PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M14	080 005704000	16110	E 14th	ACBD	TA	50.00	55,500	1.27	Retail Sales		Y	N	0	64	48	48	Approved for 48 units	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M15	080C047600100	16035	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,882	0.20	Commercial, Miscellaneous, Improved	1932	Y	N	0	10	8	8	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M16	080C047600200	16039	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,970	0.18	One story store	1947	Y	N	0	9	7	7	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M17	080C047600300	16043	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,390	0.16	Commercial, Miscellaneous, Improved	1930	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M18	080C047600501	16064	Ashland Ave	ACBD	TA	50.00	10,560	0.24	Four living units; e.g. fourplex or triplex w/SFR	1910	Y	N	4	12	9	5	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M19	080C047601101	16151	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,869	0.16	One story store	1942	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M20	080C047601103	16115	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	111,514	2.56	Mobile home park	1950	Y	N	44	128	96	52	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M21	080C049500103	16021	Ashland Ave	ACBD	TA	50.00	81,881	1.88	Warehouse	1991	Y	Y	0	94	70	70	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M22	080C050002401	15951	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	16,783	0.39	One story store	1981	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - MIXED USE PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M23	080C050002500	15957	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	12,851	0.30	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1960	Y	Y	0	15	11	11	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M24	080C050002600	15959	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	25,077	0.58	Mobile home park	1946	Y	Y	12	29	22	10	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M25	080C050002700	15965	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	22,500	0.52	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1940	Y	Y	11	26	19	8	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M26	080C050002800	15995	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	4,297	0.10	One story store	1949	Y	Y	0	5	4	4	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
TOTAL - ASHLAND							371074	8.53					71	427	320	249			

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH73	414 005602101	21030	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	14,820	0.34	One story store	1953	Y	Y	0	17	13	13	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/ Eden	General Commercial/ Medium/High Density Residential
CH74	414 005602301	21050	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	9,693	0.22	Commercial repair garage	1957	Y	Y	0	11	8	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/ Eden	General Commercial/ Medium/High Density Residential
CH75	414 008100101	21070	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	9,250	0.21	Single family residential homes used as such	1923	Y	Y	1	11	8	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/ Eden	General Commercial/ Medium/High Density Residential
CH76	414 008100200	21098	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	7,903	0.18	Vacant commercial land (may include misc. imps)		Y	Y	1	9	7	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/ Eden	General Commercial/ Medium/High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - MIXED USE PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH77	414 008100300	21106	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	10,987	0.25	One story store	1966	Y	Y	0	13	9	9	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH78	414 008100400	21120	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	7,405	0.17	One story store	1951	Y	Y	0	9	6	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH79	414 008100500	21144	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	29,625	0.68	One to five story office building	1960	Y	Y	0	34	27	27	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH80	414 008100600	21172	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	24,169	0.55	Motel	1955	Y	Y	0	28	21	21	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH81	414 008100700	21180	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	13,470	0.31	Parking lot		Y	Y	0	15	12	12	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH82	414 008100800	21222	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	16,475	0.38	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1946	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH83	414 008100900	21286	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	9,861	0.23	One to five story office building	1926	Y	Y	0	11	8	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH84	414 008101000	21288	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	9,633	0.22	Single family residential homes used as such	1926	Y	Y	1	11	8	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH85	414 008101100	21308	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,712	0.20	One to five story office building	1953	Y	Y	2	10	8	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH86	414 008101200	21328	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,276	0.19	One to five story office building		Y	Y	0	10	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - MIXED USE PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH87	414 008101300	21344	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,650	0.20	One to five story office building	1940	Y	Y	0	10	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH88	414 008101400	21366	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,300	0.19	Residential Imps on Commercial Land	1928	Y	Y	1	10	7	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH89	414 008101500	21376	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,775	0.18	One story store	1942	Y	Y	0	9	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH90	414 008101600	21380	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,300	0.17	Triplex; double or duplex with single family home	1941	Y	Y	3	8	6	3	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH91	414 008101700	21390	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,759	0.16	Two, three or four single family homes	1940	Y	Y	2	8	6	4	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
TOTAL - CHERRYLAND							219064	5.03					11	251	190	179			

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - MIXED USE PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V26	084C063001109	3889	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	17.45	11,326	0.26	Service Stations	1964	Y	N	0	5	3	3	Possible to merge with V43 and V42	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V27	084C066100606	3970	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	17.45	104,544	2.40	Mobile home park	1984	Y	N	49	42	31	-18	49 unit mobile home site, higher density may be allowed subject to specific plan guidelines.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V42	084C063000606	3937	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	95,396	2.19	Misc. industrial (improved); no other ind code	1998	Y	N	24	48	36	12	Mobile homes in the rear of property. Possible to merger with V26 and V43	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V43	084C063001117	3913	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	233,046	5.35	Mobile home park	1958	Y	N	94	117	87	-7	94 unit mobile home site, higher density may be allowed subject to specific plan guidelines. Possible to merge with V26 and V42	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V44	084C065000505	4026	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	53,100	1.22	Single family residential homes used as such	1956	N	N	1	27	20	19	Possible to merge with V59	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V45	084C065000204	4096	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	17,424	0.40	Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	9	7	7	Possible to merge with V46	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V46	084C065000100	21195	Center St	CVCBD	S10	21.78	54,450	1.25	Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	27	20	20	Possible to merge with V45	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V49	084A006001402			CVCBD	S08	30.00	24,829	0.57	BART parking lot		Y	N	0	17	13	13		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V58	084C065000611	21767	Center St	CVCBD	S10	40.00	19,602	0.45	vacant residential land, zoned 4 units or less		N	N	0	18	14	14		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
TOTAL - CASTRO VALLEY							613717	14.09					168	308	231	63			

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - MIXED USE PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z1	411 006301700	1233	Bockman Rd	PD-2209		21.78	168,627	3.87	Vacant Commercial		Y	N	0	84	81	81	Approved for 81 units residential and some commercial use per PD-2209	San Lorenzo/Eden	Medium and High Density Residential
Z2	412 003400205	15800	Hesperian Blvd.	C2		19.66	265,716	6.10	Shopping Center	1978	Y	N	0	120	90	90	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z3	412 003400607	15820	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	182,952	4.20	Shopping Center	1978	Y	N	0	83	62	62	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z4	412 003400606	15858	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	21,780	0.50	Shopping Center	1971	Y	N	0	10	7	7	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z5	412 003400908	15888	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	39,204	0.90	One story store	1963	Y	N	0	18	13	13	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z6	412 003400809	15888	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	26,136	0.60	Shopping Center		Y	N	0	12	9	9	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z7	412 003400807	15888	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	21,780	0.50	Service Stations	1969	Y	N	0	10	7	7	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z8	412 003400906	15890	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	30,492	0.70	Shopping Center	1954	Y	N	0	14	10	10	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z9	412 003401102	15918	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	60,984	1.40	Shopping Center	1954	Y	N	0	28	21	21	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - MIXED USE PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z10	412 003401307	15960	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	17,424	0.40	Shopping Center	1980	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/Village	Area 2
Z11	412 003401309	429	Paseo Grande	C1		19.66	13,939	0.32	Shopping Center	1983	Y	Y	0	6	5	5	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/Village	Area 2
Z12	412 003109300	587	Paseo Grande	C1		19.66	26,136	0.60	Vacant commercial land (may include misc. imps)		Y	Y	0	12	9	9	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/Village	Area 5A
Z13	412 003109200	507	Paseo Grande	C1		19.66	74,052	1.70	Shopping Center	1966	Y	Y	0	33	25	25	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/Village	Area 5A
Z14	412 003902303	16010	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	16,988	0.39	Bank	1966	Y	Y	0	8	6	6	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/Village	Area 4
Z15	412 003902403	16020	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	41,382	0.95	Shopping Center	1960	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/Village	Area 4
Z16	412 003900103		Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	67,954	1.56	Shopping Center		Y	Y	0	31	23	23	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/Village	Area 5B
Z17	412 004211300	16015	Via Arriba	C1		19.66	71,003	1.63	Shopping Center		Y	Y	0	32	24	24	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/Village	Area 5c

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - MIXED USE PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z18	412 003902600	16090	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	48,787	1.12	Shopping Center	1960	Y	Y	0	22	17	17	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D
Z19	412 003900402	500	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	10,890	0.25	Shopping Center	1965	Y	Y	0	5	4	4	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D
Z20	412 003900300	520	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	12,197	0.28	Shopping Center	1965	Y	Y	0	6	4	4	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D
Z21	412 003900200	550	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	71,438	1.64	Shopping Center	1976	Y	Y	0	32	24	24	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D
TOTAL - SAN LORENZO							#####	29.61					0	590	461	461			
TOTAL ALL COMMUNITIES													250	1,576	1,202	952			

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M9	080D056301700		Dermody Ave	R-3/R-4		30.00	37,897	0.87	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	26	20	20	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
M10	080D056502900		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	84,071	1.93	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	58	43	43	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, watercourse near property. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
M11	080D056503000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	43,560	1.00	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	30	23	23	Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
M12	080D056803000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	65,776	1.51	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	45	34	34	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
M13	080D056803100		Wagner St	R-S	D-15	30.00	78,844	1.81	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	54	41	41	Creek/watercourse close to property. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
M14	080 005704000	16110	E 14th	ACBD	TA	50.00	55,500	1.27	Retail Sales		Y	N	0	64	48	48	Approved for 48 units	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M15	080C047600100	16035	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,882	0.20	Commercial, Miscellaneous, Improved	1932	Y	N	0	10	8	8	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M16	080C047600200	16039	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,970	0.18	One story store	1947	Y	N	0	9	7	7	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M17	080C047600300	16043	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,390	0.16	Commercial, Miscellaneous, Improved	1930	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M19	080C047601101	16151	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,869	0.16	One story store	1942	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M21	080C049500103	16021	Ashland Ave	ACBD	TA	50.00	81,881	1.88	Warehouse	1991	Y	Y	0	94	70	70	within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek	Ashland/Eden	Commercial or Medium High Density
M22	080C050002401	15951	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	16,783	0.39	One story store	1981	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M23	080C050002500	15957	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	12,851	0.30	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1960	Y	Y	0	15	11	11	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M26	080C050002800	15995	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	4,297	0.10	One story store	1949	Y	Y	0	5	4	4	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH10	429 006402402	227	Willow Ave	R-S	D-35	12.45	16,682	0.38	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		Y	N	0	5	4	4		Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH18	431 001607500	22472	Meekland Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	8,264	0.19	Restaurant		Y	N	0	2	2	2		Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH21	429 001002400	19356	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	7,925	0.18	Industrial	1946	Y	N	0	3	2	2	Industrial uses, adjacent residential, potential RDA site	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH29	429 003200901		Meekland Av	R-S	D-3	14.52	8,578	0.20	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1975	Y	N	0	3	2	2	Merger potential with CH30	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH31	414 005102804		Locust St	R-S	DV	12.45	14,400	0.33	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		Y	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State/County property, approximate lot size, Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Merger potential with CH32	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH32	414 005103002		Foothill Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	20,576	0.47	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		Y	Y	0	10	8	8	Vacant State/County property, approximate lot size, Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Merger potential with CH31	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH35	414 008605700	21438	Locust St	R-S	DV	12.45	7,500	0.17	One story Commercial		Y	Y	0	2	2	2	Alquist-Priolo Study Area	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH47	429 006403600	130	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	19,100	0.44	Warehouse		Y	N	0	10	7	7	Need to survey to verify lot size. Merger potential with CH46	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH51	429 006405402	22008	Meekland Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	44,431	1.02	Miscellaneous improved commercial		Y	N	0	22	17	17	Merger potential with CH50	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH53	429 009102602	254	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	11,349	0.26	Two, three or four single family homes	1938	Y	N	0	3	2	2	Merger potential with CH54	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH61	429 009109900	247	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	8,645	0.20	Single family residential homes used as such	1984	Y	N	0	2	2	2	Merger potential with CH55	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH71	431 001604500	22358	Meekland Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	10,359	0.24	One to five story office building		Y	N	0	3	2	2		Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH72	431 001605200	159	Smalley Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	19,400	0.45	Church		Y	N	0	10	7	7	Boundary	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH73	414 005602101	21030	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	14,820	0.34	One story store	1953	Y	Y	0	17	13	13	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH74	414 005602301	21050	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	9,693	0.22	Commercial repair garage	1957	Y	Y	0	11	8	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH77	414 008100300	21106	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	10,987	0.25	One story store	1966	Y	Y	0	13	9	9	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH78	414 008100400	21120	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	7,405	0.17	One story store	1951	Y	Y	0	9	6	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH79	414 008100500	21144	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	29,625	0.68	One to five story office building	1960	Y	Y	0	34	27	27	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH80	414 008100600	21172	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	24,169	0.55	Motel	1955	Y	Y	0	28	21	21	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH81	414 008100700	21180	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	13,470	0.31	Parking lot		Y	Y	0	15	12	12	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH82	414 008100800	21222	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	16,475	0.38	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1946	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH83	414 008100900	21286	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	9,861	0.23	One to five story office building	1926	Y	Y	0	11	8	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH86	414 008101200	21328	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,276	0.19	One to five story office building		Y	Y	0	10	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH87	414 008101300	21344	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,650	0.20	One to five story office building	1940	Y	Y	0	10	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH89	414 008101500	21376	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,775	0.18	One story store	1942	Y	Y	0	9	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
V1	085 530000904	5349	Crow Canyon Rd	P-D		2.18	155,117	3.56	Rur,Rural,Changing To Higher Use	1952	N	Y	0	8	6	6	Within 50 feet of a creek	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V6	084C088503304			R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	19,166	0.44	Vacant		N	N	0	2	1	1		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V13	084A025000904	20396	John Dr	R-1	CSU-RV	6.22	69,260	1.59	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	10	7	7	Merger potential with V13	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V14	084A025000903	20338	John Dr	R-1	CSU	6.22	130,244	2.99	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1906	N	N	0	19	14	14	Merger potential with V14	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V20	084D118000800		Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	84,942	1.95	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	12	9	9	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V21	084D110000116		Brookdale Bl	R-1	CSU-RV	6.22	57,935	1.33	Vacant,Public Agencies,Exempt		N	N	0	8	6	6		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V22	084D118000600		Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	23,244	0.53	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	3	2	2	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V25	084D119000502		Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	24,394	0.56	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	3	3	3	Possible merger with V23-V25	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V26	084C063001109	3889	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	17.45	11,326	0.26	Service Stations	1964	Y	N	0	5	3	3	Possible to merge with V43 and V42	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V28	415 016000100	21112	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	10,484	0.24	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	5	4	4	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 - V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V29	415 016000200	21120	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	9,740	0.22	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	5	4	4	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 - V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V30	415 016000300	21128	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	8,935	0.21	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 - V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V31	415 016000400	21134	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	8,373	0.19	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 - V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V32	415 016000500	21144	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	8,006	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 - V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V35	415 023001300		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	14,363	0.33	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	7	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V36	415 023001600	22513	Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	6,481	0.15	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	3	2	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V37	415 023001700		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	7,470	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V38	415 023001900		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	8,295	0.19	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V39	415 023002100	1432	A St	R-S	D-20	21.78	7,500	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V40	415 023002200	1424	A St	R-S	D-20	21.78	6,416	0.15	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	3	2	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V45	084C065000204	4096	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	17,424	0.40	Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	9	7	7	Possible to merge with V46	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V46	084C065000100	21195	Center St	CVCBD	S10	21.78	54,450	1.25	Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	27	20	20	Possible to merge with V45	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V47	415 023001400		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	51,400	1.18	Pub,Public Agencies, Exempt		N	Y	0	26	19	19	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V48	415 023001500		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	6,554	0.15	Pub,Public Agencies, Exempt		N	Y	0	3	2	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V49	084A006001402			CVCBD	S08	30.00	24,829	0.57	BART parking lot		Y	N	0	17	13	13		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V50	415 016001100	21320	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,795	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V50 and V51	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V51	415 016001200	21338	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,466	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V50 and V51	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V52	415 016001400	21406	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,530	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V53	415 016001500	21420	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,758	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V55	415 016001800	21454	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,426	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V57	415 016002000	21484	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,330	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V58	084C065000611	21767	Center St	CVCBD	S10	40.00	19,602	0.45	Vacant residential land, zoned 4 units or less		N	N	0	18	14	14		Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V59	415 021005001	1452	Crescent Ave.	R-S	D-15	29.04	70,567	1.62	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	47	35	35	State Property, 238 Study area	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V60	415 018006801		Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	68,825	1.58	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	46	34	34	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V61	415 018006901		Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	129,373	2.97	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	86	65	65	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
F1	417 011006300	22502	Woodroe Ave	R-1		6.00	134,944	3.10	Ins,Schools	1954	N	N	0	19	14	14		Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F6	417 019010400	23047	Henry Ln	R-1					Vacant		N	N	0			0	Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F15	416 018006100	22866	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	17,832	0.41	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	2	2	2	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F16	416 018000100		Mansfield Av	R-1		6.00	60,171	1.38	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	8	6	6	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F31	417 026000400		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	3.50	330,441	7.59	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	27	20	20	Possible to merge F31 and F32 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F32	417 026000500		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	3.50	531,419	12.20	Pub,Owned By Public Utility		N	N	0	43	32	32	Possible to merge F31 and F32 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F36	425 002000507		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	2.18	246,723	5.66	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1951	N	N	0	12	9	9	Possible to merge F36 and F41 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 20,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F47	426 017000900		East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	39,894	0.92	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1960	N	Y	0	5	3	3	Within 50 feet of a creek . Adjacent to F50, possible to merge.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
F50	426 017001300		East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	47,167	1.08	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	Y	0	5	4	4	Within 50 feet of a creek . Adjacent to F47, possible to merge.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F51	426 017007300	24380	Peterson Ct	R-1	B-E	5.00	19,577	0.45	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1947	N	Y	0	2	2	2	Within 50 feet of a creek	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
HA16	432 000401302	755	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	7,275	0.17	Multi-family Residential 2 units	1993	Y	N	0	2	2	2	Lots HA16 through HA19 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA20	432 000404600	19700	Hesperial Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	63,599	1.46	Hospital	1968	Y	N	0	32	24	24		Hayward Acres/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA31	432 000803703	482	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	10,416	0.24	Triplex; double or duplex with single family home	1964	Y	N	0	3	2	2		Hayward Acres/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA52	432 002002816	897	W A St	R-S	DV	21.78	35,667	0.82	Industrial	1980	Y	N	0	18	13	13		Hayward Acres/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
Z2	412 003400205	15800	Hesperian Blvd.	C2		19.66	265,716	6.10	Shopping Center	1978	Y	N	0	120	90	90	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z3	412 003400607	15820	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	182,952	4.20	Shopping Center	1978	Y	N	0	83	62	62	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z4	412 003400606	15858	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	21,780	0.50	Shopping Center	1971	Y	N	0	10	7	7	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z5	412 003400908	15888	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	39,204	0.90	One story store	1963	Y	N	0	18	13	13	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z6	412 003400809	15888	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	26,136	0.60	Shopping Center		Y	N	0	12	9	9	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z7	412 003400807	15888	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	21,780	0.50	Service Stations	1969	Y	N	0	10	7	7	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z8	412 003400906	15890	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	30,492	0.70	Shopping Center	1954	Y	N	0	14	10	10	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z9	412 003401102	15918	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	60,984	1.40	Shopping Center	1954	Y	N	0	28	21	21	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z10	412 003401307	15960	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	17,424	0.40	Shopping Center	1980	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z11	412 003401309	429	Paseo Grande	C1		19.66	13,939	0.32	Shopping Center	1983	Y	Y	0	6	5	5	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z12	412 003109300	587	Paseo Grande	C1		19.66	26,136	0.60	Vacant commercial land (may include misc. imps)		Y	Y	0	12	9	9	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5A
Z13	412 003109200	507	Paseo Grande	C1		19.66	74,052	1.70	Shopping Center	1966	Y	Y	0	33	25	25	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5A
Z14	412 003902303	16010	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	16,988	0.39	Bank	1966	Y	Y	0	8	6	6	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 4

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z15	412 003902403	16020	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	41,382	0.95	Shopping Center	1960	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 4
Z16	412 003900103		Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	67,954	1.56	Shopping Center		Y	Y	0	31	23	23	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5B
Z17	412 004211300	16015	Via Arriba	C1		19.66	71,003	1.63	Shopping Center		Y	Y	0	32	24	24	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5c
Z18	412 003902600	16090	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	48,787	1.12	Shopping Center	1960	Y	Y	0	22	17	17	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D
Z19	412 003900402	500	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	10,890	0.25	Shopping Center	1965	Y	Y	0	5	4	4	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - VACANT PARCELS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z20	412 003900300	520	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	12,197	0.28	Shopping Center	1965	Y	Y	0	6	4	4	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D
Z21	412 003900200	550	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	71,438	1.64	Shopping Center	1976	Y	Y	0	32	24	24	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - PARCELS THAT CAN ACCOMODATE 20 OR MORE UNITS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z2	412 003400205	15800	Hesperian Blvd.	C2		19.66	265,716	6.10	Shopping Center	1978	Y	N	0	120	90	90	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
M21	080C049500103	16021	Ashland Ave	ACBD	TA	50.00	81,881	1.88	Warehouse	1991	Y	Y	0	94	70	70	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
V61	415 018006901		Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	129373	2.97	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	86	65	65	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
Z3	412 003400607	15820	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	182,952	4.20	Shopping Center	1978	Y	N	0	83	62	62	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2
Z1	411 006301700	1210 and 1294	Bockman Rd	PD-2209		21.78	168,627	3.87	Vacant Commercial		Y	N	28	84	81	53	Approved for 81 units residential and some commercial use per PD-2209	San Lorenzo/Eden	Medium and High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - PARCELS THANT CAN ACCOMODATE 20 OR MORE UNITS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M20	080C047601103	16115	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	111,514	2.56	Mobile home park	1950	Y	N	44	128	96	52	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M14	080 005704000	16110	E 14th	ACBD	TA	50.00	55,500	1.27	Retail Sales		Y	N	0	64	48	48	Approved for 48 units	Ashland/Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M10	080D056502900		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	84,071	1.93	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	58	43	43	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, watercourse near property. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
M13	080D056803100		Wagner St	R-S	D-15	30.00	78,844	1.81	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	54	41	41	Creek/watercourse close to property. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
V59	415 021005001	1452	Crescent Ave.	R-S	D-15	29.04	70567	1.62	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	47	35	35	State Property, 238 Study area	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - PARCELS THAT CAN ACCOMODATE 20 OR MORE UNITS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V60	415 018006801		Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	68825	1.58	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	46	34	34	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
M12	080D056803000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	65,776	1.51	BART parking lot		N	Y	0	45	34	34	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
F32	417 026000500		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	3.50	531,419	12.20	Pub, Owned By Public Utility		N	N	0	43	32	32	Possible to merge F31 and F32 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
CH79	414 008100500	21144	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	29,625	0.68	One to five story office building	1960	Y	Y	0	34	27	27	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/ Eden	General Commercial/ Medium/High Density Residential
Z13	412 003109200	507	Paseo	C1		19.66	74,052	1.70	Shopping	1966	Y	Y	0	33	25	25	Airport	San Lorenzo/	Area 5A
Z21	412 003900200	550	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	71,438	1.64	Shopping Center	1976	Y	Y	0	32	24	24	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - PARCELS THAT CAN ACCOMODATE 20 OR MORE UNITS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Z17	412 004211300	16015	Via Arriba	C1		19.66	71,003	1.63	Shopping Center		Y	Y	0	32	24	24	Airport influence area; Density as allowed	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 5c
HA20	432 000404600	19700	Hesperial Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	63,599	1.46	Hospital	1968	Y	N	0	32	24	24		Hayward Acres/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
Z16	412 003900103		Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	67,954	1.56	Shopping Center		Y	Y	0	31	23	23	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 5B
M11	080D056503000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	43,560	1.00	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	30	23	23	Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH80	414 008100600	21172	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	24,169	0.55	Motel	1955	Y	Y	0	28	21	21	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
Z9	412 003401102	15918	Hesperian Blvd.	C1		19.66	60,984	1.40	Shopping Center	1954	Y	N	0	28	21	21	Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/San Lorenzo Village	Area 2

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - PARCELS THANT CAN ACCOMODATE 20 OR MORE UNITS

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation		
V46	084C065000100	21195	Center St	CVCBD	S10	21.78	54,450	1.25	Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	27	20	20	Possible to merge with V45	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential		
F31	417 026000400		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	3.50	330,441	7.59	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	27	20	20	Possible to merge F31 and F32 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA		
M9	080D056301700		Dermody Ave	R-3/R-4		30.00	37,897	0.87	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	26	20	20	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential		
Z21	412 003900200	550	Via Mercado	C1		19.66	71,438	1.64	Shopping Center	1976	Y	Y	0	32	24	24	Airport influence area; Density as allowed per the San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan	San Lorenzo/ San Lorenzo Village	Area 5D		
TOTAL - CAPACITY													72	1343	1027	955					

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M2	080C048403300	964	Delano St	R-1		8.71	28,729	0.66	Res, Single Family Residence	1951	Y	N	2	6	4	2	Merger potential for M2 and M5	Ashland/ Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
M5	080C048403600	928	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	39,533	0.91	Res, Single Family Residence	1948	Y	N	1	16	12	11	Merger potential for M2 and M5	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						17.45	68,262	1.57					3	27	21	18	Assumes RS-D-25 density		

M3	080C048402306	820	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	46,008	1.06	Res, Single Family Residence	1940	Y	N	1	18	14	13	Merger potential for M3 and M4	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M4	080C048402500	854	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	21,399	0.49	Res, Multi, 2-4 Single Family Homes	1923	Y	N	2	9	6	4	Merger potential for M3 and M4	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						17.45	67,407	1.55					3	27	20	17			

M6	080C048500504	887	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	10,096	0.23	Res, Single Family Residence	1967	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential for M6 and M7	Ashland/ Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
M7	080C048500604	895	Elgin St	R-S	D-25	17.45	10,654	0.24	Res, Single Family Residence	1930	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential for M6 and M7	Ashland/ Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						17.45	20,750	0.48					2	8	6	4			

M9	080D056301700		Dermody Ave	R-3/R-4		30.00	37,897	0.87	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	26	20	20	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M10	080D056502900		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	84,071	1.93	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	58	43	43	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, watercourse near property. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M11	080D056503000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	43,560	1.00	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	30	23	23	Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M12	080D056803000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	65,776	1.51	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	45	34	34	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential
M13	080D056803100		Wagner St	R-S	D-15	30.00	78,844	1.81	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	54	41	41	Creek/watercourse close to property. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/ Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Merged Estimate						30.00	310,147	7.12					0	214	160	160			

M15	080C047600100	16035	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,882	0.20	Commercial, Miscellaneous, Improved	1932	Y	N	0	10	8	8	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M16	080C047600200	16039	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,970	0.18	One story store	1947	Y	N	0	9	7	7	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M17	080C047600300	16043	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,390	0.16	Commercial, Miscellaneous, Improved	1930	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M18	080C047600501	16064	Ashland Ave	ACBD	TA	50.00	10,560	0.24	Four living units; e.g. fourplex or triplex w/SFR	1910	Y	N	4	12	9	5	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M19	080C047601101	16151	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,869	0.16	One story store	1942	Y	N	0	8	6	6	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M20	080C047601103	16115	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	111,514	2.56	Mobile home park	1950	Y	N	44	128	96	52	Merger potential M15-20	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
Merged Estimate						50.00	152,185	3.51					48	175	132	84			

M21	080C049500103	16021	Ashland Ave	ACBD	TA	50.00	81,881	1.88	Warehouse	1991	Y	Y	0	94	70	70	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger potential M21-M26.	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M22	080C050002401	15951	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	16,783	0.39	One story store	1981	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M23	080C050002500	15957	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	12,851	0.30	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1960	Y	Y	0	15	11	11	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M24	080C050002600	15959	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	25,077	0.58	Mobile home park	1946	Y	Y	12	29	22	10	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M25	080C050002700	15965	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	22,500	0.52	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1940	Y	Y	11	26	19	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
M26	080C050002800	15995	E 14th St	ACBD	TA	50.00	4,297	0.10	One story store	1949	Y	Y	0	5	4	4	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, close to creek and riparian area. Lot merger	Ashland/ Eden	General Commercial or Medium High Density Residential
Merged Estimate						50.00	163,389	3.75					23	188	141	118			

CH2	429 001004100	310	Cherry Way	R-S	SU	8.71	19,957	0.46	Res, Single Family Residence	1940	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH7	Cherryland/ Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH7	429 001403700	316	Cherry Way	R-S	SU	8.71	19,660	0.45	Res, Single Family Residence	1952	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH2	Cherryland/ Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						8.71	39,617	0.91					2	8	6	4			

CH3	429 001400700	303	Medford Ave	R-S	SU	8.71	24,412	0.56	Res, Single Family Residence	1926	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential with CH4	Cherryland/ Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH4	429 001400802	323	Medford Ave	R-S	SU	8.71	37,757	0.87	Res, Multi-2-4 Single Family Homes	1957	Y	N	2	8	6	4	Merger potential with CH3	Cherryland/ Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						8.71	62,169	1.43					3	12	9	6			

CH5	429 001403300	350	Cherry Way	R-S	SU	8.71	19,923	0.46	Res, Single Family Residence	1948	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH6	Cherryland/ Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH6	429 001403400	342	Cherry Way	R-S	SU	8.71	19,849	0.46	Res, Single Family Residence	1947	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH5	Cherryland/ Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate (M3 and M4)						8.71	39,772	0.91					2	8	6	4			

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/ Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH11	414 007609300	770	Grove Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	17,811	0.41	Res, Single Family Residence	1924	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential CH11-14	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH12	414 007609400	752	Grove Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	20,366	0.47	Res, Multi, 2-4 Single Family Homes		Y	N	2	6	4	2	Merger potential CH11-14	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH13	414 007609500	730	Grove Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	19,848	0.46	Res, Single Family Residence	1920	Y	N	1	6	4	3	Merger potential CH11-14	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH14	414 007609600	710	Grove Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	19,465	0.45	Res, Single Family Residence	1925	Y	N	1	6	4	3	Merger potential CH11-14	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						12.45	77,490	1.78					5	22	17	12			

CH20	429 001002300	19350	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	10,260	0.24	Industrial	1918	Y	N	1	3	3	2	Industrial uses, adjacent residential, potential RDA site	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH21	429 001002400	19356	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	7,925	0.18	Industrial	1946	Y	N	0	3	2	2	Industrial uses, adjacent residential, potential RDA site	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						14.52	18,185	0.42					1	6	5	4			

CH15	429 001006100	140	Blossom Way	R-S	D-35	12.45	19,771	0.45	Res, Single Family Residence	1937	Y	N	2	6	4	2	Merger potential CH24 and 25	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH22	429 001005800	19870	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	13,287	0.31	Res, Single Family Residence	1939	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH15 and 25	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH23	429 001006000	126	Blossom Way	R-S	D-3	14.52	19,761	0.45	Res, Single Family Residence	1937	Y	N	1	7	5	4	Merger potential with CH15 and 24	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						14.52	52,819	1.21					2	18	13	11	Assumes RS-D-3 Density		

CH25	429 003200400	20449	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	15,744	0.36	Res, Single Family Residence	1953	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger Potential CH 25-28	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH26	429 003200500	20555	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	15,833	0.36	Res, Single Family Residence	1955	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger Potential CH 25-28	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH27	429 003200600	20661	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	16,444	0.38	Res, Single Family Residence	1943	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger Potential CH 25-28	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH28	429 003200700	20667	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	15,868	0.36	Res, Single Family Residence	1943	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger Potential CH 25-28	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Merged Estimate						14.52	63,889	1.47					4	21	16	12			

CH29	429 003200901		Meekland Av	R-S	D-3	14.52	8,578	0.20	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1975	Y	N	0	3	2	2	Merger potential with CH30	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH30	429 003201000	20987	Meekland Ave	R-S	D-3	14.52	14,282	0.33	Res, Single Family Residence		Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential with CH29	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						14.52	22,860	0.52					1	8	6	5			

CH32	414 005103002		Foothill Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	20,576	0.47	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		Y	Y	0	10	8	8	Vacant State/County property, approximate lot size, Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Merger potential with CH31	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH31	414 005102804		Locust St	R-S	DV	12.45	14,400	0.33	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		Y	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State/County property, approximate lot size, Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Merger potential with CH32	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	34,976	0.80					-	14	11	11			

CH34	414 005104900	20914	Locust St	R-S	DV	12.45	7,504	0.17	Single Family Residence	1925	Y	Y	1	2	2	1	Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Merger potential with CH33	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
CH35	414 008605700	21438	Locust St	R-S	DV	12.45	7,500	0.17	One story Commercial		Y	Y	0	2	2	2	Alquist-Priolo Study Area	Cherryland/Eden	Low and Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	15,004	0.34					1	8	6	5			

CH38	429 005501700	384	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	17,800	0.41	Single family residential homes used as such	1947	Y	N	1	5	4	3	45	Merger potential with CH41 and CH45	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH39	429 005501900	360	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	18,450	0.42	Single family residential homes used as such	1934	Y	N	1	5	4	3	45	Merger potential with CH40 and CH45	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH43	429 005505100	366	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	30,945	0.71	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1974	Y	N	8	15	12	4	41	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	67,195	1.54					9	34	25	16			

CH40	429 005502200	318	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	15,000	0.34	Single family residential homes used as such	1948	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH40-42	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH41	429 005502800	21836	Princeton St	R-S	DV	21.78	20,000	0.46	Two, three or four single family homes	1943	Y	N	4	10	8	4	Merger potential with CH40-42	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH42	429 005502900	21806	Princeton St	R-S	DV	12.45	18,200	0.42	Single family residential homes used as such	1930	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential with CH40-42	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate (M3 and M4)						21.78	53,200	1					5	27	20	15			

CH44	429 005902100	21823	Princeton St	R-S	DV	12.45	12,320	0.28	Single family residential homes used as such	1950	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH45	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH45	429 005902202	21837	Princeton St	R-S	DV	12.45	15,800	0.36	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1963	Y	N	1	5	3	2	Merger potential with CH44	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	28,120	0.65					2	14	11	9			

CH46	429 006403502	122	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	20,860	0.48	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1947	Y	N	1	10	8	7	Merger potential with CH47	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH47	429 006403600	130	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	19,100	0.44	Warehouse		Y	N	0	10	7	7	Need to survey to verify lot size. Merger potential with CH46	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	39,960	0.92					1	20	15	14			

CH48	429 006403800	148	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	12,850	0.29	Single family residential homes used as such	1928	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with CH49	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH49	429 006403900	152	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	16,600	0.38	Single family residential homes used as such	1932	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential with CH48	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	29,450	0.68					2	15	11	9			

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH50	429 006404700	145	Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	17,370	0.40	Single family residential homes used as such	1923	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Merger potential with CH51	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH51	429 006405402	22008	Meekland Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	44,431	1.02	Miscellaneous improved commercial		Y	N	0	22	17	17	Merger potential with CH50	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	61,801	1.42					1	31	23	22			
CH53	429 009102602	254	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	11,349	0.26	Two, three or four single family homes	1938	Y	N	0	3	2	2	Merger potential with CH54	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH54	429 009102700	248	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	16,200	0.37	Single family residential homes used as such	1923	Y	N	1	5	3	2	Merger potential with CH53	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	27,549	0.63					1	14	10	9			
CH55	429 009104103	243	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	24,697	0.57	Single family residential homes used as such	1930	Y	N	2	12	9	7	Merger potential with CH63	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
CH61	429 009109900	247	Poplar Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	8,645	0.20	Single family residential homes used as such	1984	Y	N	0	2	2	2	Merger potential with CH57	Cherryland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	33,342	0.77					2	17	13	11			
CH62	431 001200600	337	Laurel Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	22,233	0.51	Residential property converted to 5 or more units		Y	N	6	11	8	2	Merger potential CH62-64	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH63	431 001202100	324	Smalley Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,448	0.47	Two, three or four single family homes	1952	Y	N	2	10	8	6	Merger potential CH62-64	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
CH64	431 001202200	346	Smalley Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,448	0.47	Res., Multiple Family	1956	Y	N	3	10	8	5	Merger potential CH62-64	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	40,896	0.94					5	20	15	10			
CH68	431 001601400	261	Laurel Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,448	0.47	Res., Multiple Family	1952	Y	N	4	10	8	4	Merger potential CH68 and 69	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH69	431 001601500	275	Laurel Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,448	0.47	Four living units; e.g. fourplex or triplex w/SFR	1965	Y	N	4	10	8	4	Merger potential CH68 and 69	Cherryland/Eden	High and Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	40,896	0.94					8	20	15	7			

CH73	414 005602101	21030	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	14,820	0.34	One story store	1953	Y	Y	0	17	13	13	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH74	414 005602301	21050	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	9,693	0.22	Commercial repair garage	1957	Y	Y	0	11	8	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH75	414 008100101	21070	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	9,250	0.21	Single family residential homes used as such	1923	Y	Y	1	11	8	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH76	414 008100200	21098	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	7,903	0.18	Vacant commercial land (may include misc. imps)		Y	Y	1	9	7	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH77	414 008100300	21106	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	10,987	0.25	One story store	1966	Y	Y	0	13	9	9	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH78	414 008100400	21120	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	7,405	0.17	One story store	1951	Y	Y	0	9	6	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH79	414 008100500	21144	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	29,625	0.68	One to five story office building	1960	Y	Y	0	34	27	27	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH80	414 008100600	21172	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TC	50.00	24,169	0.55	Motel	1955	Y	Y	0	28	21	21	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH81	414 008100700	21180	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	13,470	0.31	Parking lot		Y	Y	0	15	12	12	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
CH82	414 008100800	21222	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	16,475	0.38	Miscellaneous improved commercial	1946	Y	Y	0	19	14	14	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH83	414 008100900	21286	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	9,861	0.23	One to five story office building	1926	Y	Y	0	11	8	8	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH84	414 008101000	21288	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	9,633	0.22	Single family residential homes used as such	1926	Y	Y	1	11	8	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH85	414 008101100	21308	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,712	0.20	One to five story office building	1953	Y	Y	2	10	8	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH86	414 008101200	21328	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,276	0.19	One to five story office building		Y	Y	0	10	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH87	414 008101300	21344	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,650	0.20	One to five story office building	1940	Y	Y	0	10	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH88	414 008101400	21366	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	8,300	0.19	Residential Imps on Commercial Land	1928	Y	Y	1	10	7	6	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH89	414 008101500	21376	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,775	0.18	One story store	1942	Y	Y	0	9	7	7	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH90	414 008101600	21380	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	7,300	0.17	Triplex; double or duplex with single family home	1941	Y	Y	3	8	6	3	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
CH91	414 008101700	21390	Mission Blvd	ACBD	TA	50.00	6,759	0.16	Two, three or four single family homes	1940	Y	Y	2	8	6	4	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger potential sites CH73-91	Cherryland/Eden	General Commercial/Medium/High Density Residential
Merged Estimate						50.00	219,064	5					5	251	189	184	Such a large merger is not probable, but smaller mergers may be. Requires further analysis		

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V4	084D116800800	18791	Lamson Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	35,284	0.81	Res,Single Family Residence	1946	N	N	1	4	3	2	Merger potential with V4, V5, V7 and V8	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V5	084D116802404	18880	Walnut Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	29,621	0.68	Res,Single Family Residence	1948	N	N	1	3	2	1	Merger potential with V4, V5, V7 and V8	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V7	084D116801000	18837	Lamson Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	46,174	1.06	Res,Single Family Residence	1950	N	N	1	5	3	2	Merger potential with V4, V5, V7 and V8	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V8	084D116802300	18886	Walnut Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	4.36	46,174	1.06	Res,Single Family Residence	1946	N	N	1	5	3	2	Merger potential with V4, V5, V7 and V8	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
Merged Estimate						4.36	157,253	3.61					4	16	12	8			

V13	084A025000904	20396	John Dr	R-1	CSU-RV	6.22	69,260	1.59	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	10	7	7	Merger potential with V13	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V14	084A025000903	20338	John Dr	R-1	CSU	6.22	130,244	2.99	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1906	N	N	0	19	14	14	Merger potential with V14	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
Merged Estimate						6.22	199,504	4.58					0	28	21	21			

V16	084D118002800	4635	Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	19,672	0.45	Res,Multi,2-4 Units,Boarding Use	1946	N	N	1	3	2	1	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V17	084D118000400	4643	Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	24,394	0.56	Res,Single Family Residence	1955	N	N	1	3	3	2	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V18	084D118000500	4651	Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	35,284	0.81	Res,Single Family Residence	1946	N	N	1	5	4	3	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V19	084D118000700	4659	Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	58,806	1.35	Res,Single Family Residence	1948	N	N	1	8	6	5	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V20	084D118000800		Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	84,942	1.95	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	12	9	9	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V22	084D118000600		Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	23,244	0.53	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	3	2	2	Possible merger with V16 to V20 and V22	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
Merged Estimate						6.22	246,342	5.66					0	35	26	26			

V23	084D118502200	4800	Sorani Way	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	29,621	0.68	Res,Single Family Residence	1973	N	N	1	4	3	2	Possible merger with V23-V25	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
-----	---------------	------	------------	-----	------------	------	--------	------	-----------------------------	------	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V24	084D119000405	4806	Sorani Way	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	25,265	0.58	Res, Single Family Residence	1973	N	N	1	4	3	2	Possible merger with V23-V25	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V25	084D119000502		Proctor Rd	R-1	B-E-CSU-RV	6.22	24,394	0.56	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	3	3	3	Possible merger with V23-V25	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
Merged Estimate						6.22	79,280	1.82					1	11	8	7			

V28	415 016000100	21112	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	10,484	0.24	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	5	4	4	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 -V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V29	415 016000200	21120	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	9,740	0.22	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	5	4	4	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 -V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V30	415 016000300	21128	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	8,935	0.21	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 -V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V31	415 016000400	21134	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	8,373	0.19	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 -V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V32	415 016000500	21144	Oak St	R-S	DV	21.78	8,006	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	Vacant State property, Alquist-Priolo Study area. Lot merger possible for sites V28 -V32	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
Merged Estimate						21.78	45,538	1.05					0	23	17	17			

V33	415 023001100	22447	Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	7,500	0.17	Single Family Residence,		N	Y	1	4	3	2	State Property, 238 Study area,	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General
V34	415 023001200	22459	Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	7,500	0.17	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	1	4	3	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V35	415 023001300		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	14,363	0.33	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	7	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V36	415 023001600	22513	Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	6,481	0.15	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	3	2	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V37	415 023001700		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	7,470	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V38	415 023001900		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	8,295	0.19	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V39	415 023002100	1432	A St	R-S	D-20	21.78	7,500	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	4	3	3	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V40	415 023002200	1424	A St	R-S	D-20	21.78	6,416	0.15	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	Y	0	3	2	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V47	415 023001400		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	51,400	1.18	Pub,Public Agencies, Exempt		N	Y	0	26	19	19	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential
V48	415 023001500		Ruby St	R-S	D-20	21.78	6,554	0.15	Pub,Public Agencies, Exempt		N	Y	0	3	2	2	State Property, 238 Study area, within creek buffer. Lot merger possible V33 to V40, V47 and V48.	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Suburban and Low Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Merged Estimate						21.78	115,979	3					0	58	43	43			

V26	084C063001109	3889	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	17.45	11,326	0.26	Service Stations	1964	Y	N	0	5	3	3	Possible to merge with V43 and V42	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V42	084C063000606	3937	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	95,396	2.19	Misc. industrial (improved); no other ind code	1998	Y	N	24	48	36	12	Mobile homes in the rear of property. Possible to merger with V26 and V43	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V43	084C063001117	3913	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	233,046	5.35	Mobile home park	1958	Y	N	94	117	87	-7	94 unit mobile home site, higher density may be allowed subject to specific plan guidelines. Possible to merge with V26 and V42	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	339,768	7.80					118	170	127	9	Higher densities possible per specific plan.		

V45	084C065000204	4096	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	17,424	0.40	Public Agency, Exempt		Y	N	0	9	7	7	Possible to merge with V46	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
V46	084C065000100	21195	Center St	CVCBD	S10	21.78	54,450	1.25	Public Agency, Exempt		Y	N	0	27	20	20	Possible to merge with V45	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	71,874	1.65					0	36	27	27			

V50	415 016001100	21320	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,795	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V50 and V51	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V51	415 016001200	21338	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,466	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V50 and V51	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
Merged Estimate						34.85	15,261	0.35					0	12	9	9			

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V52	415 016001400	21406	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,530	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V53	415 016001500	21420	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,758	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V54	415 016001600	21408	Oak St	R-4		34.85	6,917	0.16	Residential building of 2 or more units, Public Agencies, Exempt		N	N	2	6	4	2	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
Merged Estimate						34.85	22,205	1					2	18	13	11			

V41	415 016002600	21457	Gary Dr	R-1	CSU-RV	21.78	8,450	0.19	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	1	4	3	2	State Property, 238 Study area, Alquist-Priolo Study Area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed: Residential, Medium Density Multi-family
V55	415 016001800	21454	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,426	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V56	415 016001900	21462	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,405	0.17	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt	1940	N	N	1	6	4	3	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V57	415 016002000	21484	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,330	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
Merged Estimate						34.85	30,611	0.70					2	24	18	16	Assumes R-4 density		

V44	084C065000505	4026	Castro Valley Blvd	CVCBD	S10	21.78	53,100	1.22	Single family residential homes used as such	1956	N	N	1	27	20	19	Possible to merge with V59	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Medium and High Density Residential
-----	---------------	------	--------------------	-------	-----	-------	--------	------	--	------	---	---	---	----	----	----	----------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------------

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V59	415 021005001	1452	Crescent Ave.	R-S	D-15	29.04	70567	1.62	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	47	35	35	State Property, 238 Study area	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
Merged Estimate						29.04	123,667	2.84					1	82	62	61	Assumes higher density for 4026 Castro Valley Blvd as allowed in the Specific Plan.		

V60	415 018006801		Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	68825	1.58	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	46	34	34	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V61	415 018006901		Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	129373	2.97	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	86	65	65	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V62	415 018007300	1459	Grove Way	R-S	D-15	29.04	35247	0.81	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	1	24	18	17	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger possible V60 - V62	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
Merged Estimate						29.04	233,445	5					1	156	117	116			

F3	417 019006500	23031	Henry Ln	R-1		6.00	20,970	0.48	Res, Single Family Residence	1925	N	N	1	3	2	1	Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F4	417 019006600	23039	Henry Ln	R-1		6.00	22,455	0.52	Res, Single Family Residence	1950	N	N	1	3	2	1	Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F5	417 019010300	23047	Henry Ln	R-1		6.00	20,502	0.47	Res, Single Family Residence		N	N	1	3	2	1	23047 Henry lane parcels were merged in 2008. Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F6	417 019010400	23047	Henry Ln	R-1					Vacant		N	N	0			0	Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F7	417 019006800	23063	Henry Ln	R-1		6.00	16,787	0.39	Res, Single Family Residence	1954	N	N	1	2	2	1	Potential to merge all Henry lane parcels	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
Merged Estimate						6.00	80,714	1.85					1	11	8	7			

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
F8	417 006007100	2700	Kelly St	R-1		6.00	29,374	0.67	Res, Single Family Residence	1947	N	Y	1	4	3	2	Within 50 feet of a creek. Lot merger potential F8 to F11	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F9	417 006007000	2658	Kelly St	R-1		6.00	19,744	0.45	Res, Single Family Residence	1928	N	Y	1	3	2	1	Within 50 feet of a creek. Lot merger potential F8 to F11	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F10	417 006007600	2600	Kelly St	R-1		6.00	26,203	0.60	Res, Single Family Residence	1979	N	Y	1	4	3	2	Within 50 feet of a creek. Lot merger potential F8 to F11	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F11	417 006007700	2598	Kelly St	R-1		6.00	53,444	1.23	Res, Single Family Residence	1922	N	N	1	7	6	5	Lot merger potential F8 to F11	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
Merged Estimate						6.00	128,765	2.96					4	18	13	9			

F14	416 018006200	22866	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	14,224	0.33	Res, Single Family Residence	1954	N	N	1	2	1	0	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F15	416 018006100	22866	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	17,832	0.41	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	2	2	2	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F16	416 018000100		Mansfield Av	R-1		6.00	60,171	1.38	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	N	0	8	6	6	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F17	416 020000200	23000	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	37,563	0.86	Res, Single Family Residence	1979	N	N	1	5	4	3	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F18	416 020000100	23093	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	87,875	2.02	Res, Single Family Residence	1975	N	N	1	12	9	8	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/ Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
F19	416 020000300	23090	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	30,369	0.70	Res,Single Family Residence	1944	N	N	1	4	3	2	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F20	416 020000400	23098	Mansfield Ave	R-1		6.00	60,370	1.39	Res,Single Family Residence	1927	N	N	1	8	6	5	May be possible to merger into single Mansfield development.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
Merged Estimate						6.00	308,404	7.08					5	42	32	27			

F21	417 022001201	3216	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	106,860	2.45	Vacant,Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1937	N	N	1	9	6	5	Possible to merge F21, F23, F25, F26 and F28	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F23	417 022001104	3230	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	44,744	1.03	Res,Single Family Residence	1960	N	N	1	4	3	2	Possible to merge F21, F23, F25, F26 and F28	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F25	417 022002500	23756	Maud Ave	R-1		6.00	24,015	0.55	Res,Single Family Residence	1953	N	N	1	3	2	1	Possible to merge F21, F23, F25, F26 and F28	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F26	417 022002400	23790	Maud Ave	R-1		6.00	32,464	0.75	Res,Single Family Residence	1927	N	N	1	4	3	2	Possible to merge F21, F23, F25, F26 and F28	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F28	417 022002200	23830	Maud Ave	R-1		6.00	24,239	0.56	Res,Single Family Residence	1960	N	N	1	3	3	2	Possible to merge F21, F23, F25, F26 and F28	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 5,000 sq. ft. MBSA
Merged Estimate						6.00	232,322	5.33					2	32	24	22	Assumes higher 6 du/ac		

F24	417 024001204	3289	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	81,458	1.87	Res,Single Family Residence		N	N	1	7	5	4	Possible o merge F24 and F29	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F29	417 024000500	3291	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	82,880	1.90	Res,Single Family Residence	1877	N	N	1	7	5	4	Possible o merge F24 and F29	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
Merged Estimate (M3 and M4)						3.50	164,338	3.77					2	13	10	8			

F27	417 024000100	3247	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	130,644	3.00	Res,Single Family Residence	1925	N	N	1	10	8	7	Possible to merge F27 and F30	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F30	417 025000100	3231	D St	R-1	B-E	3.50	35,399	0.81	Res,Single Family Residence	1953	N	N	1	3	2	1	Possible to merge F27 and F30	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
Merged Estimate (M3 and M4)						3.50	166,043	3.81					2	13	10	8			

F31	417 026000400		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	3.50	330,441	7.59	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units			N	N	0	27	20	20	Possible to merge F31 and F32 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F32	417 026000500		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	3.50	531,419	12.20	Pub, Owned By Public Utility			N	N	0	43	32	32	Possible to merge F31 and F32 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 10,000 sq. ft. MBSA
Merged Estimate						3.50	861,860	19.79					0	69	52	52				

F36	425 002000507		Fairview Av	R-1	B-E	2.18	246,723	5.66	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1951		N	N	0	12	9	9	Possible to merge F36 and F41 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 20,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F41	425 002000304	24867	Fairview Ave	R-1	B-E	2.18	181,220	4.16	Res, Single Family Residence	1912		N	N	1	9	7	6	Possible to merge F36 and F41 to create a larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 20,000 sq. ft. MBSA
Merged Estimate						2.18	427,943	9.82					1	21	16	15				

F42	426 018001200	1859	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	29,376	0.67	Res, Single Family Residence	1975		N	Y	1	3	3	2	Within 50 feet of a creek. May be possible to merge F42 to F46 and F51 to create a single larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F43	426 017000100	1875	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	52,858	1.21	Res, Single Family Residence	1930		N	Y	1	6	5	4	Within 50 feet of a creek. May be possible to merge F42 to F46 and F51 to create a single larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F44	426 017000300	1907	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	76,857	1.76	Res, Single Family Residence	1951		N	Y	1	9	7	6	Within 50 feet of a creek. May be possible to merge F42 to F46 and F51 to create a single larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F45	426 017000400	1921	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	52,460	1.20	Res, Single Family Residence	1964		N	Y	1	6	5	4	Within 50 feet of a creek. May be possible to merge F42 to F46 and F51 to create a single larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
F46	426 017005100	1947	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	50,094	1.15	Res, Single Family Residence		N	N	1	6	4	3	Within 50 feet of a creek. May be possible to merge F42 to F46 and F51 to create a single larger tract.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F51	426 017007300	24380	Peterson Ct	R-1	B-E	5.00	19,577	0.45	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1947	N	Y	0	2	2	2	Within 50 feet of a creek	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
Merged Estimate						5.00	281,222	6.46					5	32	24	19			

F48	426 016000100	2085	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	52,114	1.20	Res, Single Family Residence	1962	N	Y	1	6	4	3	Within 50 feet of a creek . Adjacent to F49, possible to merge.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F49	426 016000300	2091	East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	24,950	0.57	Res, Single Family Residence		N	Y	1	3	2	1	Within 50 feet of a creek . Adjacent to F48, possible to merge.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
Merged Estimate						5.00	77,064	1.77					2	9	7	5			

F47	426 017000900		East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	39,894	0.92	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units	1960	N	Y	0	5	3	3	Within 50 feet of a creek . Adjacent to F50, possible to merge.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
F50	426 017001300		East Ave	R-1	B-E	5.00	47,167	1.08	Vacant, Res Land Zoned 4 Units		N	Y	0	5	4	4	Within 50 feet of a creek . Adjacent to F47, possible to merge.	Fairview/Fairview	R-1; 6,000 sq. ft. MBSA
Merged Estimate						8.71	87,061	2.00					0	17	13	13			

HA3	412 009501700	509	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	26,862	0.62	Four living units; e.g. fourplex or triplex w/SFR	1953	Y	N	4	13	10	6	Lots HA3 through HA7 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA4	412 009501800	513	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	40,560	0.93	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1959	Y	N	11	20	15	4	Lots HA3 through HA7 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA5	412 009501900	533	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	23,877	0.55	Single family res home with non-economic 2nd unit	1941	Y	N	2	12	9	7	Lots HA3 through HA7 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
HA6	412 009502000	553	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	16,808	0.39	Single family residential homes used as such	1942	Y	N	1	5	4	3	Lots HA3 through HA7 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA7	412 009502100	573	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	43,560	1.00	Church	1962	Y	N	1	22	16	15	Lots HA3 through HA7 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	151,667	3.48					19	76	57	38			

HA8	429 006800300	21271	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	35,000	0.80	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1967	Y	N	8	18	13	5	Lots HA8 through HA10 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA9	429 006800501	21341	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	21,000	0.48	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1966	Y	N	6	11	8	2	Lots HA8 through HA10 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA10	429 006800900	265	Flint Ct	R-S	DV	21.78	50,000	1.15	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1962	Y	N	6	25	19	13	Lots HA8 through HA10 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	106,000	2.43					20	53	40	20			

HA14	429 007700400	22123	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	15,000	0.34	Single family residential homes used as such	1940	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Lots HA14 and 15 adjacent, possible to merge	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA15	429 007700500	22147	Hathaway Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	15,000	0.34	Single family residential homes used as such	1920	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Lots HA14 and 15 adjacent, possible to merge	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	30,000	0.69					2	15	11	9			

HA16	432 000401302	755	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	7,275	0.17	Multi-family Residential 2 units	1993	Y	N	0	2	2	2	Lots HA16 through HA19 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA17	432 000401402	759	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	53,572	1.23	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1957	Y	N	13	27	20	7	Lots HA16 through HA19 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
HA18	432 000401504	781	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	31,463	0.72	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1970	Y	N	9	16	12	3	Lots HA16 through HA19 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA19	432 000403604	704	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	35,500	0.81	Multi-Family Residential, converted to five or more units	1954	Y	N	11	18	13	2	Lots HA16 through HA19 are adjacent, possible to merge.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	127,810	2.93					33	64	48	15			

HA21	432 000800100	409	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	27,000	0.62	Light industrial	1956	Y	N	2	14	10	8	Possible to merger HA21 and HA22. Could also merge with 310 Bartlett	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA22	432 000800400	441	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	37,750	0.87	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1955	Y	N	10	19	14	4	Possible to merger HA21 and HA22. Could also merge with 310 Bartlett	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA25	432 000802100	310	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	25,160	0.58	Misc. industrial (improved); no other ind code	1920	Y	N	1	13	9	8	Could combine with 441 and 409 Sunset	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	89,910	2					13	45	34	21			

HA23	432 000800600	463	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	40,837	0.94	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1960	Y	N	11	20	15	4	Possible to merge with 370 Bartlett	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA24	432 000801806	370	Bartlett Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	40,838	0.94	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1964	Y	N	12	20	15	3	Possible to merge with 463 W Sunset	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	81,675	1.88					23	41	31	8			

HA26	432 000802400	20555	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,347	0.47	Two, three or four single family homes	1924	Y	N	2	10	8	6	Sites HA 26 through 30 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
------	---------------	-------	------------	-----	----	-------	--------	------	--	------	---	---	---	----	---	---	---	--------------------	----------------------------

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
HA27	432 000802500	20563	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	22,000	0.51	Five or more single family res homes	1953	Y	N	6	11	8	2	Sites HA 26 through 30 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA28	432 000802602	20625	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	24,680	0.57	Four living units; e.g. fourplex or triplex w/SFR	1963	Y	N	4	12	9	5	Sites HA 26 through 30 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA29	432 000802802	20789	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	36,896	0.85	Church	1972	Y	N	1	18	14	13	Sites HA 26 through 30 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA30	432 000803400	571	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	12.45	16,870	0.39	Two, three or four single family homes	1925	Y	N	2	5	4	2	Sites HA 26 through 30 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	120,793	3					15	57	43	28			

HA33	432 001200100	410	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	41,022	0.94	Single family residential homes used as such	1942	Y	N	1	21	15	14	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA34	432 001200902	21132	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	12.45	13,824	0.32	Single family residential homes used as such	1938	Y	N	1	4	3	2	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA35	432 001201004	21164	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	29,417	0.68	Double or duplex type - two units	1945	Y	N	2	15	11	9	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA36	432 001201103	21190	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	59,422	1.36	Res., Multiple Family	1963	Y	N	18	30	22	4	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
HA37	432 001201302	21266	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,350	0.47	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1960	Y	N	5	10	8	3	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA38	432 001201502	21338	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	30,238	0.69	Residential property converted to 5 or more units	1945	Y	N	7	15	11	4	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA39	432 001202500	387	Lupine Way	R-S	DV	21.78	41,818	0.96	Multiple residential building of 5 or more units.	1960	Y	N	10	21	16	6	Sites HA33 through 39 are all adjacent, possible to merge into single tract.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	236,091	5.42					44	118	89	45			

HA41	432 001601700	21233	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,500	0.47	Multi-family Residential 3 units	1963	Y	N	3	10	8	5	Possible to merge HA41 to HA43.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA42	432 001601800	21247	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	41,000	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more SFRs	1946	Y	N	5	21	15	10	Possible to merge HA41 to HA43.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA43	432 001602000	21335	Garden Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	37,000	0.85	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1953	Y	N	11	19	14	3	Possible to merge HA41 to HA43.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	98,500	2.26					19	49	37	18			

HA45	432 001603802	21134	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	41,060	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1956	Y	N	11	21	15	4	Possible to merge HA45 to HA48.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA46	432 001604102	20962	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	40,760	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1958	Y	N	11	20	15	4	Possible to merge HA45 to HA48.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA47	432 001604202	20930	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	40,760	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, converted to five or more units	1959	Y	N	11	20	15	4	Possible to merge HA45 to HA48.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA48	432 001606600	21064	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	52,141	1.20	Multi-Family, Condominium		Y	N	17	26	20	3	Possible to merge HA45 to HA48.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	174,721	4.01					50	87	66	16			

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - LOTS WITH MERGER POTENTIAL

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
HA49	432 002000300	20913	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	110,000	2.53	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1960	Y	N	24	55	41	17	Next to 21031 Royal	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA50	432 002000400	21031	Royal Ave	R-S	DV	21.78	20,500	0.47	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1939	Y	N	6	10	8	2	Next to 20913 Royal	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	130,500	3.00					30	65	49	19			

HA54	432 002003402	830	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	41,000	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units		Y	N	12	21	15	3	Lot configuration suggests potential to merge lots HA54 to HA57.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA55	432 002003500	806	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	41,060	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, converted to five or more units	1948	Y	N	5	21	15	10	Lot configuration suggests potential to merge lots HA54 to HA57.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA56	432 002003602	790	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	40,760	0.94	Multi-Family Residential, five or more units	1961	Y	N	11	20	15	4	Lot configuration suggests potential to merge lots HA54 to HA57.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
HA57	432 002003702	766	W Sunset Blvd	R-S	DV	21.78	44,300	1.02	Multi-Family Residential, converted to five or more units	1965	Y	N	9	22	17	8	Lot configuration suggests potential to merge lots HA54 to HA57.	Hayward Acres/Eden	Medium Density Residential
Merged Estimate						21.78	167,120	4					37	84	63	26			

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - R-4 (MULTIFAMILY) SITES


Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
M10	080D056502900		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	84,071	1.93	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	58	43	43	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel, watercourse near property.	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
M12	080D056803000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	65,776	1.51	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	45	34	34	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
M11	080D056503000		Wagner St	R-3/R-4		30.00	43,560	1.00	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	30	23	23	Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
M9	080D056301700		Dermody Ave	R-3/R-4		30.00	37,897	0.87	BART parking lot		Y	Y	0	26	20	20	Flood Zone within 50 feet of parcel. Merger Potential with M9 - M13	Ashland/Eden	Medium Density Residential
V50	415 016001100	21320	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,795	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V50 and V51	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V53	415 016001500	21420	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,758	0.18	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - R-4 (MULTIFAMILY) SITES

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V52	415 016001400	21406	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,530	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	5	5	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V51	415 016001200	21338	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,466	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V50 and V51	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V55	415 016001800	21454	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,426	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V57	415 016002000	21484	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,330	0.17	Vacant, Public Agency, Exempt		N	N	0	6	4	4	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
V56	415 016001900	21462	Oak St	R-4		34.85	7,405	0.17	Single Family Residence, Public Agency, Exempt	1940	N	N	1	6	4	3	State Property, 238 Study area. Lot merger potential V41 and V55 to V57	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING ELEMENT SITES INVENTORY - R-4 (MULTIFAMILY) SITES

Map ID	APN	Street Number	Street Name	Zone	Sub-zone	Allowable Density	Square Feet	Lot Acres	Existing Use	Year Built	PDA	Env. Const.	Existing Units (A)	Maximum Capacity	Realistic Capacity (B)	Net Yield (B-A)	Notes	Community/Area or Specific Plan	Plan Designation
V54	415 016001600	21408	Oak St	R-4		34.85	6,917	0.16	Residential building of 2 or more units, Public Agencies, Exempt		N	N	2	6	4	2	State Property, 238 Study area. Merger potential V52 to V54	Castro Valley/ Castro Valley	Unspecified in current General Plan. Proposed GP: Medium Density Multifamily.
TOTAL - CAPACITY							290,931	6.68					3	207	155	152			



STARVIEW DR
ALAMONT RD
PLACER DR
MIDLAND RD
SOL ST
FAIRMONT DR

M10
M9
M12
M13

M26
M28
M14
M20
M23
M21
M3
M1
M4
M5
M6
M8

Z2
Z3
Z7
Z5
Z9
Z10
Z12
Z14
Z16
Z15
Z17
Z19

HA3
HA28
HA8
HA6
HA27
HA10
HA34
HA29
HA24
HA1
HA33
HA36
HA12
HA38
HA39
HA23
HA21
HA20
HA52
HA51
HA44
HA39
HA58
HA54
HA47
HA13
HA14
HA17

CH10
CH50
CH48
CH53
CH55
CH57
CH64
CH54
CH70
CH66
CH72
CH74
CH18

CH34
CH33
CH35
CH77
CH80
CH86
CH92
CH38
CH37
CH9
CH8
CH7
CH16
CH17
CH12
CH14
CH41
CH44
CH40
CH42

V16
V18
V20
V23
V21
V2
V3
V5
V4
V8
V7
V14
V15
V51
V31
V52
V57
V65
V63
V64
V62
V34
V49
V41

V10
V11
V12
V13
V28
V47
V45
V44
V43
V50
V27
F2
F5
F11
F14
F16
F18
F20
F22
F21
F23
F25
F28
F30
F29
F24
F27
F32
F31
F33
F36
F41
F39
F38
F35
F42
F45
F47
F43
F44
F50
F49
F52

F11
F14
F16
F18
F20
F22
F21
F23
F25
F28
F30
F29
F24
F27
F32
F31
F33
F36
F41
F39
F38
F35
F42
F45
F47
F43
F44
F50
F49
F52

F11
F14
F16
F18
F20
F22
F21
F23
F25
F28
F30
F29
F24
F27
F32
F31
F33
F36
F41
F39
F38
F35
F42
F45
F47
F43
F44
F50
F49
F52

F11
F14
F16
F18
F20
F22
F21
F23
F25
F28
F30
F29
F24
F27
F32
F31
F33
F36
F41
F39
F38
F35
F42
F45
F47
F43
F44
F50
F49
F52

This page has been intentionally left blank

EVALUATION OF THE PREVIOUS HOUSING ELEMENT

Government Code Section 65588 requires that each local jurisdiction review its past accomplishments as part of their Housing Element update. Specifically, each locality must assess:

- (1) The appropriateness of the housing goals, objectives, and policies in contributing to the attainment of the state housing goal;
- (2) The effectiveness of the housing element in attainment of the community's housing goals and objectives; and
- (3) The progress of the city, county, or city and county in implementing the housing element.

This chapter evaluates past performance and assesses the continued relevance of those goals, principles and programs described in the 2007-2014 Housing Element in addressing Alameda County's current and future housing needs.

In accordance with State law, Alameda County established the following outcomes for its housing plan:

- Provide adequate sites, with appropriate zoning and development standards and services to accommodate the locality's share of the regional housing needs for each income level; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(1))
- Assist in the development of adequate and affordable housing to meet the needs of extremely low-, very low-, low- and moderate-income households; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(2))
- Address, and where possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement and development of housing, including housing for all income levels and housing for persons with disabilities; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(3))
- Conserve and improve the condition of the existing affordable housing stock; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(4))
- Preserve assisted housing developments at-risk of conversion to market-rate; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(6)(d))
- Promote equal housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, marital status, ancestry, national origin, color, familial status or disability; (Government Code Section 65583(c)(5))
- Encourage building development that incorporates sustainable and energy efficient features (Government Code Section 65583(a)(7))

REVIEW OF ALAMEDA COUNTY’S HOUSING PROGRAM

Goal 1: Provide sites suitable for housing development that can accommodate a range of housing by type, size, location and tenure.

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	Effectiveness
<p>Policy 1.1 Assist housing developers in identifying and consolidating suitable sites for the development of housing affordable to a wide range of households. (Community Development Agency) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Development is planned for parcels assembled by the formal Redevelopment Agency. These projects include San Lorenzo Senior Housing and Ashland Family Housing.</p>	<p>This is an effective program as the County continues ways to explore the development of sites that may be utilized for housing.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 1.2 Consider all County-owned and other public lands for their suitability as housing sites and adopt and support land use plans, disposition agreements and development programs to provide a range of housing on appropriate sites. (Real Estate Division: Public Works Agency) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>There were no residential developments on county owned lands within the unincorporated areas during the planning period. However, is planned to occur on parcels assembled by the formal Redevelopment Agency.</p>	<p>This is an effective program as the County continues ways to explore the development of sites that may be utilized for housing.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	Effectiveness
<p>Policy 1.3 Complete centralized accessible information service for each parcel in the Unincorporated Area of the County, including planning and zoning information, and physical constraints. (County Planning Department, County Public Works Agency)</p>	<p>The Planning Department and the Public Works Agency are in the process of developing a computerized geographic information system (GIS) for all unincorporated parcels, and a pilot project has been completed. The database will be accessible to all County departments and eventually be available to the public by means of the internet. Data for each parcel will include: the assessor parcel number, zoning, FEMA rating, fire zone, location of infrastructure, as well as orthophotographs with superimposed parcel boundary lines. The database will be web-enabled and linked to MetroScan. The Planning Department has also developed a smaller GIS for unincorporated parcels in the West County that facilitates project planning.</p>	<p>This "policy" is currently underway but has not been completed. It is expected to be completed by the end of 2015.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> This has been reclassified as a program rather than a policy, and would fall under the program "Web Based Planning and Zoning Information".</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	Effectiveness
<p>Policy 1.4 Maintain adequate land appropriately zoned for a mix of rental and sale housing which is consistent with demand for these types of units. (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>In 2005 and 2006, the County underwent a process of rezoning land in order to accommodate the County's RHNA. The County believes that these parcels are sufficient to meet the current and projected demand for housing within the unincorporated areas.</p>	<p>As required by State law, the County will maintain a Sites Inventory listing parcels that may accommodate housing for sale or rental.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it has been revised is now Policy 1.3.</p>
<p>Policy 1.5 Provide timely reports on the status of housing development in the Unincorporated County.</p>	<p>The County has prepared and submitted Annual Progress Reports to State HCD for 2007-2014 as required. These reports were considered by both the Alameda County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.</p>	<p>Per Government Code Section 65400, local governments are required to annually report on the progress of implementation of their general plans.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 1.4.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	Effectiveness
<p>Policy 1.6 Review development potential under current zoning, and revise zoning to increase densities, where appropriate, to ensure appropriate use of scarce land resources and compatibility with existing uses. (County Planning Department)</p>	<p>In 2005 and 2006 the County modified the zoning of several hundred parcels as part of its Housing Element Implementation. In deciding which parcels to rezone, the County considered existing infrastructure, recent development trends in the area, and current and future access to transit. As a part of its updates to the Eden Area and Castro Valley Area Plans the County performed a close assessment of potential land use incompatibilities and if necessary rezone parcels to avoid this impact .</p>	<p>The County has been effective in ensuring that projects and zoning modifications are compatible with existing adjacent uses and densities.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Delete; this action was completed as part of the update of the Eden and Castro Valley General Plans.</p>
<p>Residential Sites Inventory (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Revised as a part of the Housing Element Update. Please refer to Appendix A of the Adopted Housing Element.</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Web Based Zoning and Planning Information (County Planning Department, County Public Works Agency)</p>	<p>In process. Staff must verify the accuracy of the data before it can be made public.</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Annual Progress Report (County Planning Department)</p>	<p>Alameda County has prepared annual reports for each year of the previous housing element period.</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Goal 2: To ensure that there is a wide range of housing opportunities for current and future residents of the unincorporated communities.

Principles: Provide a mix of affordable housing consistent with the needs of all income groups. Priority should be given to maintaining and improving the supply of housing available to very-low, low and moderate-income households. Over-concentrations of subsidized housing should be avoided.

The housing supply should include a mix of rental and sale housing units that is consistent with demand for these types of units.

Ensure adequate housing opportunities for population groups or persons with special housing needs. Housing facilities for these groups should, to the extent possible, be integrated into existing residential neighborhoods and housing developments and sited to provide convenient access to public and private services and facilities.

Permit manufactured homes placed on a permanent foundation, subject to applicable building and zoning regulations, on any site that a conventional dwelling is permitted.

Recognize the value of mobile home parks in providing affordable home ownership opportunities for low- and moderate-income households.

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 2.1 Coordinate with the private sector in the development of affordable and special needs housing for rental and homeownership. When and where appropriate, promote such development through incentives.</p>	<p>The Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department and former Redevelopment Agency (now Economic and Civic Development Department) have partnered with a number of private non-profit developers on affordable housing developments. Examples include the Ashland Family Housing project where the County partnered with Resources for Community Development and Mercy Housing who is collaborating with the County on the Mercy Senior Housing development in San Lorenzo.</p>	<p>Very effective. The County has been very effective at partnering with non-profit housing developers.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 2.2 Participate in State and federal housing programs.</p>	<p>The Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department participates in a wide range of Federal and State affordable housing programs. HCD is the lead agency for the Urban County CDBG Program, and for the Alameda County Consortium HOME Program. HCD administers the countywide Mortgage Credit Certificate Program to assist first-time homebuyers. HCD administers the countywide Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) program to develop housing and provide services for persons living with AIDS. HCD has led the county-wide continuum of care process to maximize federal resources to meet the needs of the homeless. Through this process, HCD has obtained funding through Shelter Plus Care, the Supportive Housing Program, and the HUD Section 202 and Section 811 financing.</p>	<p>Very effective. The County has been very effective at successfully applying for and supporting applications for, competitive housing funds at the State and Federal levels, as described in the Status column.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue/Modify/Delete: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
	<p>Tax credits have been used by a number of projects in the county. State of California resources accessed include the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA) HELP Program, and the Multi-family Housing Program. Redevelopment Project areas established in the unincorporated county areas of Ashland, Cherryland, Castro Valley, and San Lorenzo have generated Housing Set Aside Funds to be used for affordable housing projects and programs. The Alameda County Housing Authority actively pursues all funding available to it, including additional allocations of Section 8 and Public Housing funds.</p>	
<p>Policy 2.3 Provide education on the problems and needs in the area of housing as a means of changing ingrained negative attitudes towards the provision of low and moderate-income housing. (County Planning Department, County Housing and Community Development Department, Nonprofit Organizations) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>HCD has assisted in a number of efforts to provide education on the needs for, and benefits of, affordable housing. The non-profit organization East Bay Housing Organizations coordinates an annual “Affordable Housing Week” including press information, tours, and other outreach. HCD funds the efforts of Fair Housing organizations whose charge is to educate tenants and landlords on a wide range of housing issues. The Consolidated Plan and the EveryOne Home Plan to End Homelessness address this issue as well.</p>	<p>The specific efforts undertaken have been very effective; however, the need to engage the community in meaningful dialogues about the need for affordable housing continues.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 2.4 Encourage participation at the neighborhood level towards a solution of housing problems through seminars, community meetings and dialogue with local officials. (County Planning Department, County Housing and Community Development Department, Nonprofit Organizations) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The County HCD Department projects and Redevelopment Agency conduct neighborhood meetings in targeted Unincorporated Areas. Residents and others who are highly involved may be appointed by the Board of Supervisors to the Housing and Community Development Advisory Committee or the Redevelopment Citizen’s Advisory Committee. Neighborhood development reviews and the promotion of neighborhood program participation are among the tasks of these advisory committees. In addition HCD has consistently supported East Bay Affordable Housing Week, conducted by East Bay Housing Organizations, during which community meetings, seminars and housing tours, dialogues with public officials, and other events are held to highlight affordable housing needs and solutions.</p>	<p>The specific efforts undertaken have been very effective. Participation towards housing solutions is still needed.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 2.5 Use all present methods and develop new methods of providing economic assistance to provide affordable housing for all persons residing in the County. (County Housing and Community Development Department, Housing Authority, County Planning Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>HCD supports moderate income first time homebuyers through the Mortgage Credit Certificate Program countywide. HCD provides direct assistance to the development of new affordable housing by financing a portion of the acquisition and construction costs of non-profit developed housing. A variety of funding sources, including tax exempt bonds, local housing trust fund, HOME and CDBG, HOPWA are used. The Redevelopment Agency also finances affordable housing through its Housing Set Aside Funds.</p>	<p>Use of present methods has been very effective. Development of new methods has achieved success but more is needed.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Modify; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however it has been revised.</p>
<p>Policy 2.6 Encourage federal, State and local legislation and programs to provide housing assistance. (County Planning Department, County Housing and Community Development Department, County Housing Authority) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Housing legislation is reviewed on a regular basis and recommendations are forwarded to the legislature. The County consistently supports programs and additional funding at the Federal, State, and local level to provide housing assistance that will benefit residents of Alameda County. The County HCD also spearheaded the creation of the National Shelter Plus Care Coalition to work towards sustained Federal funding for this critical housing resource for disabled homeless people.</p>	<p>Effective. In general funding levels for Federal, State, and local housing assistance programs have been maintained or increased.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 2.7 Encourage and support research to enable more rapid data collection and analysis in the field of housing. (County Planning Department, County Housing and Community Development)</p>	<p>The Planning Department and the Building Inspection Department have jointly developed a shared database that enables “smart” permitting. The shared database enables tracking of the project from start to finish as it proceeds through the permitting requirements of the two departments. The system facilitates data collection because project information can be easily accessed in one location by computer.</p>	<p>The Public Works Smart Permit and Planning Department Zoning Enforcement programs are up and running and have proven very effective. The Planning Department’s application program is being finalized.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 2.8 Prevent exclusionary housing actions that put undue pressures on surrounding communities. (County Planning Department, County Housing and Community Development Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The County HCD actively coordinates efforts to prevent exclusionary housing actions. Examples of this include tenant and landlord education and counseling services. The County Planning Department has consistently supported higher density development up to the maximum allowed by zoning and plan policies, often in the face of community opposition.</p>	<p>The planning processes and efforts which County HCD has spearheaded have been very effective at encouraging "fair share" efforts towards solving the housing problems of specific population groups.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 2.9 Develop and consider adoption of an Inclusionary Zoning ordinance to promote inclusion of affordable housing in new residential developments. (County Housing and Community Development Department, County Planning Department, Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors)</p>	<p>The County initiated an Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance feasibility study in September 2008. While much progress was made, it was decided to table the study until the economy and housing market showed more favorable signs.</p>	<p>This program was not completed. It has not been included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Delete; this implementation step is not included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 2.10 Develop policies and procedures to give priority expedited processing to residential developments that include a significant portion of units restricted to low- or moderate-income households. (County Planning Department, County Building Inspection Department)</p>	<p>The County adopted the Density Bonus Ordinance in 2005 and updated it in 2012. The Ordinance offers incentives to developers that include affordable housing in their residential developments.</p>	<p>The County has been successful in establishing a Density Bonus Ordinance that includes a provision for expedited processing of affordable housing applications.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Modify; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it has been revised. It has been combined with Policy 2.11.</p>
<p>Policy 2.11 Modify appropriate ordinances and policies to reduce and/or waive fees for residential developments that include a significant portion of units restricted to low- or moderate-income households. Allow these developments to pay fees upon issuance of Certificate of Occupancy. (County Planning Department, County Building Inspection Department)</p>	<p>Under State Density Bonus law, developers may request expedited processing or other incentives for their projects that include a minimum number of units restricted to low income households or seniors. The County has also adopted a Park Dedication Fee ordinance that may be waived for low or moderate- income housing. The County has also adopted a Park Dedication Fee ordinance that may be waived for low or moderate-income housing.</p>	<p>The Planning Director has the authority to reduce or waive fees for housing units restricted to low or moderate-income households.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Modify; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it has been revised. It has been combined with Policy 2.10.</p>
<p>Policy 2.12 Sponsor and support legislation to provide and expand federal tax incentives to stimulate investment in low- and moderate-income housing, including Low Income Housing Tax Credits, Mortgage Credit Certificates, and tax-exempt financing. (Board of Supervisors, County Administrator) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors reviews State and Federal housing legislative on a regular basis and forwards recommendations to the legislature. The County consistently supports programs and additional funding at the Federal, State, and local level to provide housing assistance that will benefit residents of Alameda County.</p>	<p>The County has been effective in their efforts .</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Modify; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it has been revised to reflect the need to find new sources of funding following the dissolution of redevelopment agencies across the state. It is</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
		now Policy 2.11.
<p>Policy 2.13 Using the Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, review County Density Bonus Ordinance and consider amendments to offer incentives in exchange for deeper affordability and/or an increase in the number of affordable units. (County Planning Department, County Housing and Community Development Department, County Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors)</p>	<p>The Density Bonus Ordinance was adopted by the Alameda County Board of Supervisors in 2012.</p>	<p>The County has completed this task. <u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Delete; this implementation step is not included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 2.14 Maintain and update information on area rental housing availability in assessing demand for rentals.</p>	<p>The County contracts with Eden I&R to maintain information on affordable area rental housing.</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 2.12.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 2.15 Enforce provisions of the County Zoning Ordinance and the County Building Code, which, since 1981, permit the placement of modular homes and mobile homes, built since 1976 and placed on a permanent foundation to be located on any site on which a conventional dwelling unit is permitted. (County Planning Department, County Building Inspection Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The County continues to permit modular and mobile homes that have been built since 1976 and have permanent foundations to be located in single family and rural zoned areas.</p>	<p>There has been very little modular or mobile home development in the urban areas of the County, except for some secondary housing units. There has been more mobile home development in the rural areas, where they are used for security or caretaker's housing.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 2.13.</p>
<p>Policy 2.16 Review existing Mobile Home Rent Stabilization Ordinance and amend to include specific provisions regarding allowable reasons for increasing rents over the allowed maximum, increasing the review fee, and providing for sufficient notice for tenants of all proposed rent increases. (County Planning Department, County Housing and Community Development Department)</p>	<p>This action was not completed during the planning period.</p>	<p>This action has been included in the 2015 Housing Element Update.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 2.14.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 2.17 Continue to support the Community Reinvestment Act to encourage financial institutions to provide loans in high-risk areas and for affordable housing developments. (County Housing and Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>HCD has participated in a number of programs with lenders as part of the Community Reinvestment Act. Lenders have participated in first time homebuyer opportunities as part of their CRA requirements, offering attractive terms to the participants. HCD has also worked closely with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board's Affordable Housing Program on a number of projects throughout the county. The County, as the lead agency in the Alameda County HOME Consortium will be reviewing private lending activity in high risk areas as part of the implementation of the federally mandated "Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing", and will be working with lenders to implement the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, as well as to work to end the current high rate of home foreclosures.</p>	<p>The Community Reinvestment Act has been an effective incentive to encourage private lenders to provide loans to projects that they might otherwise not have funded. The County has effectively used private financing to leverage its subsidy investments in subsidized housing for lower-income households.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 2.15.</p>
<p>Policy 2.18 Using the Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, review and, as appropriate, revise or create zoning districts and regulations, and site development and planned development district standards and guidelines to support appropriate mixed-use residential/commercial development. (County Planning Department)</p>	<p>The County adopted Design Guidelines in 2014 that will be used in the development of mixed use sites.</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Delete; this task has been completed.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
Policy 2.19 Coordinate planning efforts with local water and sewer providers.	The County notifies water and sewer providers of pending developments and long range planning projects and solicits their input.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 2.17.
Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance	In June 2008, The Alameda County Community Development Agency executed a contract with Vernazza Wolfe and Associates to develop an inclusionary zoning study. This project was halted due to the Recession and resulting reduction in housing production. Several court decisions (such as <i>Palmer/Sixth Street Properties v. City of Los Angeles</i>) have brought into question the legality of Inclusionary Zoning ordinances in California. As a result, the County believes that such an Ordinance is infeasible barring action at the State level. No further action will be taken with respect to this item.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Delete; this implementation step is not included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Density Bonus Program	In 2012, the County revised its Density Bonus Ordinance to fully comply with State law.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Delete; this implementation step is not included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Secondary Units	Staff continues to provide technical assistance to the public. The County will continue to monitor the Zoning Ordinance to ensure consistency with State law.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
EveryOne Home	Participating agencies meet regularly to coordinate efforts.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Modify; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element as "Housing Opportunities for the Homeless".

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
HIV/AIDS Housing and Services	Efforts to provide assistance to low-income persons with HIV/AIDS are ongoing. Funded services include: Affordable housing development, tenant-based rental assistance, short-term housing and housing placement.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
First Time Homebuyer Resources	CDA-HCD continues to provide resources to first time homebuyers.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Mortgage Credit Certificate	CDA-HCD continues to administer Alameda County's Mortgage Credit Certificate Program.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Section 8 Housing Programs	Assistance to qualified applicants is ongoing.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Family Self Sufficiency Program (FSS)	Assistance to qualified applicants is ongoing.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Affordable Housing Development	The Alameda County Housing and Community Development Department and the Economic and Civic Development Department (ECD) both provide financial support to affordable housing developments within the unincorporated areas. Currently there are two projects planned within the unincorporated areas: Ashland Family Apartments and San Lorenzo Senior Housing.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.

Goal 3: Mitigate governmental constraints or mandates to housing development and affordability.

Principles: Provide a mix of affordable housing consistent with the needs of all income groups. Priority should be given to maintaining and expanding the supply of housing available to very-low, low and moderate-income households. Over concentrations of subsidized housing should be avoided.

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 3.1 Review ordinances and requirements that may unnecessarily increase the cost of housing or be working at cross-purposes in implementing the goals of the Housing Element. (County Planning Department, County Housing and Community Development Department, County Public Works Agency)</p>	<p>The County has established an Ordinance Review Committee to evaluate requirements that may pose a constraint to the development of housing within the unincorporated areas. The Ordinance Review Committee and the County's various boards and Commissions tasked with land use decision making periodically review ordinances and procedures for consistency with State law and County policy. Most recently members of the Committee were asked to participate in the development of Design Guidelines.</p>	<p>The County has been proactive in its review of housing policies and guidelines.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Modify; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 3.2.</p>

<p>Policy 3.2 Using the Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, review requirements for on- and off-site improvements for new developments, define what “excessive” requirements are, identify “excessive” potential requirements, and make every effort to reduce these “excessive” requirements, if any. (County Planning Department, County Public Works Agency)</p>	<p>The County has established and maintained an Ordinance Review Committee and they continue to be engaged about land use development concerns in Unincorporated Alameda County.</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Modify; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 3.2.</p>
<p>Policy 3.3 Increase the residential height limit to a maximum of 40 feet in transit-oriented mixed-use development districts and high-density residential districts to ensure that multifamily housing can be effectively built. Allow exceptions to this maximum through the use of Conditional Use Permits. (County Planning Department)</p>	<p>The County amended its Zoning Ordinance, the Castro Valley Central Business District and Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plans to allow heights in excess of 40 feet. The newly adopted Design Guidelines are also intended to facilitate development of high density multifamily housing.</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 3.4 Using the Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, analyze the 25-foot height requirement in medium density residential zones and other zones, and consider modifications to these requirements, as appropriate. (County Planning Department)</p>	<p>Members of the Committee were asked to participate in the development of Design Guidelines. The key goal of the project is to provide clarity and certainty about site planning and architectural design expectations. This requirement was analyzed and modifications have been made to better accommodate medium density developments.</p>	<p>The Design Guidelines have been completed and adopted.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Delete.</p>

<p>Policy 3.5 Using the Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, analyze the impact of the County's parking requirements on the development of housing and modify the requirements if needed, especially as they relate to the provision of affordable and senior housing. (County Planning Department)</p>	<p>The Committee participated in the development of the County's newly updated Density Bonus Ordinance which applies to developments which contain affordable and senior housing.</p>	<p>The Design Guidelines have been completed and adopted. In addition, the County has updated its Density Bonus Ordinance to comply with State law.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Delete.</p>
<p>Policy 3.6 Maintain a community-based Ordinance Review Advisory Committee, whose purpose would be to assist the County in developing proposed changes to zoning regulations, site review requirements, and similar requirements as noted in the Housing Element implementing actions listed below. (Board of Supervisors, County Planning Department)</p>	<p>The County has established and maintained an Ordinance Review Committee. Most recently members of the Committee were asked to participate in the development of Design Guidelines.</p>	<p>The committee has met to evaluate proposed Ordinance changes. This program is ongoing.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 3.1.</p>
<p>Ordinance Review Committee</p>	<p>The Ordinance Review Advisory Committee (ORAC) did meet in 2012 to review several amendments to the County's Zoning Ordinance necessary to implement the Housing Element.</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Design Guidelines</p>	<p>The Design Guidelines project was initiated in 2008. The Alameda County Board of Supervisors has adopted the Design Guidelines, and they will go into effect in 2015.</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Delete; this program has been completed.</p>

Goal 4: To ensure a supply of sound housing units in safe and attractive residential neighborhoods.

Principles: All housing should be adequately maintained and, where needed, rehabilitated to protect the health and safety of residents while still maintaining affordability.

Maintain and improve the quality of residential neighborhoods. Incompatible residential and non-residential projects should be excluded where they would significantly impair desirable residential qualities. Compatible mixed-use developments should be supported in commercial areas adjacent to and on the edges of residential areas. Public facilities in and services to residential areas should be adequately maintained and, where necessary, improved.

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 4.1 Enforce applicable provisions of the housing and building codes. (County Building Inspection Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The Code Enforcement Manager, operating out of the Planning Department, enforces the zoning code and identifies substandard and illegal units through complaints received from the public. The Building Inspection Department of the County Public Works Agency enforces compliance with the housing code as part of the approval process for a building permit and as part of the complaint process initiated by the Code Enforcement Manager. Fire and health officials are also authorized to enforce abatement of substandard housing conditions as appropriate.</p>	<p>This has been a very well received and successful program, and has been expanded to allow Code Enforcement Officers to deal with Building, Housing, and Fire codes as well as Neighborhood Preservation and Zoning Ordinances.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 4.2 Stimulate neighborhood and community improvement by providing financial and technical assistance in the form of low interest loans, technical assistance and code enforcement. (County Planning Department, Economic and Civic Development Department, County Housing and Community Development Department, County Building Inspection Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The County Planning Department's Zoning Enforcement division administers the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance. The County Housing and Community Development Department administers a Community Development Block Grant-funded neighborhood improvement program that provides home improvement grants and loans for lower-income households in unincorporated neighborhoods.</p>	<p>These programs have been very successful in improving the communities. They have spent all the monies available to them, and could easily use more if it were available. They have funded programs such as street improvements, including undergrounding of utilities along a major thoroughfare, construction of parks and community centers, façade improvement programs, graffiti abatement, tenant improvement programs, etc. Despite these successes, the dissolution of Redevelopment will have an ongoing impact on the County's ability to fund these efforts going forward.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 4.3 Sponsor and support legislation that would increase funding available to low and moderate income housing rehabilitation programs. (Board of Supervisors, County Administrator) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The Board of Supervisors reviews State and Federal housing legislation on a regular basis and forwards recommendations to the legislature. The County consistently supports programs and additional funding at the Federal, State, and local level to provide housing assistance that will benefit residents of Alameda County.</p>	<p>The County has supported legislation and other means of increasing available funding to support housing rehabilitation in the County.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 4.4 Provide adequate funding for maintenance and improvement of public facilities within the unincorporated areas, such as child care, and services provided to residential areas. (County Planning Department, County Public Works Agency, and Service Agencies) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The County Public Works Agency maintains Unincorporated County facilities on an on-going basis. The Hayward Area Recreation Department maintains several parks and community facilities in the Unincorporated County on an on-going basis. The County HCD Department assists in the maintenance and improvement of Unincorporated County lower-income neighborhoods through public infrastructure and neighborhood facilities funding utilizing Community Development Block Grant funds. The County Redevelopment Agency assists in the maintenance and improvement of residential areas within established Redevelopment Areas.</p>	<p>The County has been fairly successful in maintaining and improving public facilities for residential areas. However, severe budgetary constraints, including decreasing State support, have often caused deferral of maintenance or improvement, or have precluded initiation of new projects.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 4.5 Enforce the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance. Review and revise, as necessary. (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The Code Enforcement Manager, acting out of the Community Development Agency's Planning Department, enforces the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance approved by the Board in 1989 and later modified in 1999 to include non-residential and rural properties in addition to urban residential properties. This ordinance addresses property nuisances by requiring that properties be maintained to specified standards. The new procedure cuts down on the length of the notification and hearing process, allows the County Construction Department to send out a contractor to bring the property into compliance, and authorizes recovery of payment by a property lien. The enforcement process was streamlined at the beginning of 2001 with the hiring of two additional Zoning Investigators (for a total of 4 investigators) and the implementation of a more rigorous compliance procedure. Currently, there are five investigators that serve Unincorporated Alameda County.</p>	<p>The Code Enforcement Program has been very successful and has been expanded several times during the plan period to bring other types of violations under its aegis. The Program has also received a great deal of community support, which has contributed greatly to its success.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 4.6 Enforce applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The County Planning Department uses the Zoning Ordinance and State laws such as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as the basis of its analysis of proposed land uses and development.</p>	<p>The County has been effective in its application of the Zoning Ordinance and CEQA.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 4.7 Continue providing accessibility improvements under housing rehabilitation programs to increase the ability of physically disabled people to a) obtain and retain appropriate housing, and b) live independently. (County Housing and Community Development Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The County continues to finance accessibility improvements on homes through CDBG funded housing rehabilitation programs.</p>	<p>The County has provided funding to support improvements to many residents in the unincorporated areas.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 4.8 Prepare a study to determine the cost and feasibility of reinstating housing code enforcement by the County Building Inspection Department. (Building Inspection Department)</p>	<p>At one time, the Building Inspection Department received funds from the County's General Fund to perform inspections inside housing suspected to be substandard. Now that these funds are no longer available, the Building Inspection Department will only inspect the inside of an existing rental housing unit when a tenant makes a complaint about substandard conditions.</p>	<p>This program has not been implemented due to budgetary constraints. Therefore, its effectiveness cannot be evaluated.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 4.10 Continue providing housing rehabilitation programs. (County Housing and Community Development Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>HCD continues to administer a wide range of rehabilitation programs in jurisdictions throughout the County. In the unincorporated county, HCD and the Redevelopment Agency fund single-family rehabilitation services ranging from minor home repairs to full rehabilitation loans for low-income homeowners. Special programs developed recently include seismic retrofit assistance, and energy conservation assistance.</p>	<p>The County's housing rehabilitation programs have been very effective, which is evidenced by the number of units rehabilitated and by the fact that cities continue to contract with the County to provide these services on their behalf.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Modify; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element. This step is covered under Policy 4.9.</p>
<p>Policy 4.11 Continue to support the Community Reinvestment Act to encourage financial institutions to provide loans in high-risk areas and for affordable housing developments. (County Housing and Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>HCD has participated in a number of programs with lenders as part of the Community Reinvestment Act. Lenders have participated in first time homebuyer opportunities as part of their CRA requirements, offering attractive terms to the participants. HCD has also worked closely with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board's Affordable Housing Program on a number of projects throughout the county. The County, as the lead agency in the Alameda County HOME Consortium will be reviewing private lending activity in high risk areas as part of the implementation of the federally mandated "Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing", and will be working with lenders to implement the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, as well as to work to end the current high rate of home foreclosures.</p>	<p>The Community Reinvestment Act has been an effective incentive to encourage private lenders to provide loans to projects that they might otherwise not have funded. The County has effectively used private financing to leverage its subsidy investments in subsidized housing for lower-income households.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 4.10.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
Policy 4.12 Review and, as appropriate, revise or create zoning districts and regulations, and site development and planned development district standards and guidelines to support appropriate mixed-use residential/commercial development. (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)	The County has established an Ordinance Review Committee to evaluate requirements that may pose a constraint to the development of housing within the unincorporated areas. The Ordinance Review Committee and the County's various boards and Commissions tasked with land use decision making periodically review ordinances and procedures for consistency with State law and County policy. Most recently members of the Committee were asked to participate in the development of Design Guidelines which includes standards and guidelines pertaining to mixed use development.	The County has been proactive in its review of housing policies and guidelines. <u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Modify; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 4.11.
Minor Home Repair	This program continues to serve Alameda County residents. It is currently overseen by the Housing and Community Development Department.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Accessibility Grants	This program continues to serve Alameda County residents. It is currently overseen by the Housing and Community Development Department.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Curb Appeal/Paint Grants	This program was funded with Redevelopment Funds; therefore, this program no longer exists.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Delete; this program is not included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Rehabilitation Loans	This program continues to serve Alameda County residents. It is currently overseen by the Housing and Community Development Department.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
Foreclosure Prevention	HCD continues to provide links on their website to foreclosure prevention resources.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Graffiti Abatement	This program was funded with Redevelopment Funds; therefore, this program no longer exists.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Delete; this program is not included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP)	Through the Neighborhood Stabilization Program, 14 single family homes have been purchased, rehabilitated and sold to households at 120% of AMI. These homes were blighted and foreclosed upon, and have been returned to the market. All program funds have been expended.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Delete; this program is not included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Lead Based Paint Program	ACLPPP (now Healthy Homes Department) continues to provide assistance to property owners, tenants, and contractors on lead poisoning prevention.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Code Enforcement	The Code Enforcement Division continues to investigate complaints relating to the Neighborhood Preservation, Junk Vehicle and Zoning Ordinances.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.

Goal 5: Seek to preserve units at risk of losing their affordability restrictions.

Principle Provide a mix of affordable housing consistent with the needs of all income groups. Priority should be given to maintaining and improving the supply of housing available to very-low, low and moderate-income households. Over-concentrations of subsidized housing should be avoided.

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 5.1 Monitor and encourage federal and State efforts to ensure retention of existing federally subsidized housing stock. (County Housing and Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>HCD will monitor the projects at risk of conversion to market rate during the term of this Housing Element update.</p>	<p>The County was successful in efforts to preserve 185 units of subsidized, affordable housing during the 1999-2006 planning period.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 5.2 Evaluate the feasibility of allocating local resources to preserve these units and prevent the displacement of low- and moderate-income households. (County Housing and Community Development Department, Board of Supervisors) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>HCD will monitor the projects at risk of conversion to market rate during the term of this Housing Element update.</p>	<p>No "at-risk" units were lost during the previous cycle.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 5.3 Evaluate potential impacts of public and private projects on the existing housing supply. Restrict development or require that adequate replacement housing be provided when projects will result in substantial losses of low and moderate cost housing units. (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>Available information suggests that there have been no public or private projects that have resulted in the loss of affordable housing. Gains in existing or potential affordable housing have been achieved through the County's redevelopment projects, publicly assisted housing, and the small number of private projects that exceeded 50 units.</p>	<p>The County has been effective evaluating projects and their potential impacts on existing affordable housing.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
Policy 5.4 Continue to maintain a system for keeping track of all subsidized low and moderate-income units. (County Housing and Community Development Program, County Housing Authority) (Ongoing)	The County HCD Department maintains a database of all subsidized housing units in Alameda County, by city and unincorporated county. The database was most recently updated in 2008. It includes public housing, number of Section 8 vouchers in place at the time of the survey, and earliest possible opt out dates for projects with project-based subsidies.	This program has been effective in tracking subsidized housing units. <u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Preservation of At Risk Housing	Staff continues to maintain the database of at risk units, and continues to pursue funding to support affordable housing preservation. No "at-risk" units were lost during the previous cycle.	No "at-risk" units were lost during the previous cycle. <u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.

Goal 6: To ensure equal housing opportunity for all persons without discrimination in accordance with State and Federal laws.

Principle Everyone who finances, sells, or rents properties should do so without regard to race, color, national origin, religion, sex, family status, sexual orientation or disability in accordance with State and Federal law.

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 6.1 Codify the County's practice of offering reasonable accommodations in zoning and other requirements for residential developments serving disabled people or households with a disabled member in accordance with State and federal law, into written policies and procedures. Publicize the availability of these policies and procedures. (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The County amended its Zoning Ordinance in 2006 to include Section 17.60 for Reasonable Accommodations. The County needs to develop materials to inform the public of this program.</p>	<p>The County amended its Ordinance, and intends to develop materials to inform the public of these policies.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 6.2 Complete an analysis of the potential and actual governmental constraints upon the development, maintenance and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities. (County Planning Department, Housing and Community Development Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>While formal analysis has not been conducted, the adoption of the Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance coupled with the ADA requirements implemented by the Building Department is a first step to reduce potential constraints for housing for persons with disabilities.</p>	<p>The County's development review process complies with State and Federal law.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Modify; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 6.3 Develop programs that remove constraints or provide reasonable accommodations for housing designed for persons with disabilities. (County Planning Department, Housing and Community Development Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>In 2006, the County adopted its Reasonable Accommodations Ordinance to address potential barriers in the development of housing for disabled persons.</p>	<p>This program has not been implemented due to budgetary constraints. Therefore, its effectiveness cannot be evaluated.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is not included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
Policy 6.4 Continue to support organizations that are active in fair housing education and counseling and housing discrimination investigation. (County Housing and Community Development Department) (Ongoing)	HCD has assisted in a number of efforts to provide education on the needs for, and benefits of, affordable housing. The non-profit organization East Bay Housing Organizations coordinates an annual "Affordable Housing Week" including press information, tours, and other outreach. HCD funds the efforts of Fair Housing organizations whose charge is to educate tenants and landlords on a wide range of housing issues. The Consolidated Plan and the EveryOne Home Plan to End Homelessness address this issue as well.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Fair Housing Services	HCD continues to provide funding to support fair housing counseling and mediation services.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.

Goal 7: To minimize the adverse environmental impacts of new residential development

Principles: Encourage new residential development to locate on vacant or underutilized sites within the existing urban area, or on land contiguous to existing urban areas and where development would result in more efficient use of existing public services and facilities and improve housing opportunities close to employment centers, shopping areas, preschools and schools, and major transportation facilities.

In terms of site planning and building design, all new residential projects should prevent underutilization of scarce land resources while also being compatible with adjoining residential uses.

Residential projects should utilize a variety of housing types, unit clustering, and special construction techniques, where these will preserve natural topographic, landscape and scenic qualities.

Encourage the utilization of passive and active solar energy collection systems and other energy saving and water conservation measures in residential developments.

All residential projects should be sited, designed and landscaped to: ensure privacy and adequate light, air and ventilation to units and residential open space areas; provide adequate and usable private indoor and outdoor spaces; and ensure adequate visual and acoustical buffering and/or separation between residential units and adjoining non- residential units and major transportation facilities.

Wherever possible the principles of the Eden Area Livability Initiative shall be used to guide land use policy and decision making.

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
Policy 7.1 Review and, as appropriate, revise zoning regulations, site development standards, and planned development district standards and guidelines to favor in-fill development. (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)	In general, infill is encouraged by General Plan policy and by the County's secondary unit policy that allows secondary units in single-family residential districts that have the infrastructure to support higher density. The County's Sites Inventory (Appendix A) identifies infill parcels to accommodate future	This program has been effective. <u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 7.2 Review and, as appropriate, revise service-related development fees and assessments to encourage development in areas where minimal improvements to infrastructure would be required. (Service Agencies, County Administrator) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>development.</p> <p>Development fees and related service fees may be, and have been, waived or reduced for affordable housing projects. A comparison of development fees in Alameda County indicates that the County's fees for residential projects in the unincorporated County are lower or on par with most cities in the County that have approached buildout and are dealing primarily with infill. In comparison to cities in the County that are developing raw land and thus extending services, the County's fees are significantly lower and thus do not serve as a constraint to new market rate development.</p>	<p>This program has been effective.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 7.3 Review utilization of Secondary Unit provisions of Zoning Ordinance. Review standards and revise, as needed to promote utilization while minimizing adverse impacts. (County Planning Department)</p>	<p>Alameda County has revised its Ordinance and policies to be consistent with State law regarding second units.</p> <p>Second units are a permitted use in zones where single family residences are allowed, subject to specific requirements for size, setbacks, parking, etc.</p>	<p>This action was not completed during the previous period; it has been included in the Housing Element update.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 7.4 Develop and consider adoption of revisions to Zoning Ordinance to require minimum densities for new residential developments in all residential zoning categories. (County Planning Department, Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors)</p>	<p>While there is no minimum density requirement, residential developments in the urban unincorporated area are usually developed at the maximum allowed density.</p>	<p>This action was not completed during the previous period; it has been included in the Housing Element update.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 7.5 Identify areas adjacent to or in close proximity to transit and transportation corridors that are appropriate for high-density residential development. Re-zone as appropriate to increase densities. (County Planning Department, Planning Commission, Board of Supervisors)</p>	<p>The County has identified areas close to transit that are suitable for residential development as a part of its 2005-2006 Housing Element Implementation, and has rezoned them accordingly.</p>	<p>This action was completed. The County will consider opportunities for transit-oriented development as a part of the ongoing maintenance of the Sites Inventory.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 7.6 Continue specific policies and guidelines for development in areas of significant environmental resources and hazards. (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The General Plan contains specific guidelines for hillside and riparian resources. The County Public Works Agency implements and enforces the Alameda County Grading and Watercourse Ordinances. The Grading Ordinance regulates grading for the purpose of controlling erosion and preventing slope hazards. The Watercourse Ordinance safeguards and preserves watercourses, prevents damage due to flooding, controls sedimentation, and enhances their recreational and beneficial uses. The East County Area Plan's Table 9 provides environmental standards for subdivision and site development review for agricultural parcels. Environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and review under the Planned Development district and Site Development Review process also provide the County with a means to protect environmental resources and prevent impacts to housing from geological</p>	<p>These programs have proven effective in preserving topographic features.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 7.7 Enforce requirements of the Subdivision Map Act and "Title 24" of the State Building Code and any other requirements providing for solar access and energy conservation. (County Planning Department, County Building Inspection Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>hazards. All proposed residential units are checked by the Building Inspection Department to ensure that their design and construction complies with the Title 24 standards and other applicable State standards relating to energy conservation. The California Energy Commission updates the energy codes with regularity and has recently released emergency standards for energy efficiency in new buildings. The Planning Department enforces domestic plumbing and water conservation guidelines in the site review process.</p>	<p>These programs have been very effective in achieving this goal. <u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 7.8 Promote energy efficiency and solar generation through provision of low-interest loans, grants, and technical assistance. (County Planning and Housing and Community Development Departments) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>HCD has financed installations of solar panels on affordable housing developments as well as weatherization and energy efficiency improvements on single family homes through housing rehabilitation programs. HCD awards points in competitive funding processes for developments which include high levels of energy efficiency.</p>	<p>HCD has been successful in incorporating energy efficiency within its housing programs. <u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.</p>
<p>Policy 7.9 Utilize adopted plans, environmental review, site review and planned development provisions. (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The Planning Department utilizes environmental reviews as prescribed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Site Development Review and rezoning to the Planned Development district with the intention of creating a well-designed and environmentally sensitive project.</p>	<p>As noted, Site Development Review and Planned Development District zoning has proven very effective in balancing provision of housing with protection of the natural environment. <u>Continue/Modify/Delete:</u> Continue; this policy is now Policy 7.13.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
<p>Policy 7.10 Enforce applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance; review and revise as necessary. (County Planning Department) (Ongoing)</p>	<p>The Zoning Ordinance is frequently reviewed by the Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission to accommodate community needs, and to ensure consistency with State and Federal law.</p>	<p>The County has been effective in enforcing the zoning ordinance. As part of the Housing Element review, the County continues to seek ways to enforce the existing requirements without exacerbating the cost of developing affordable housing to the extent practicable. Affordable housing is sometimes impacted by zoning requirements in terms of the overall cost to develop. The Goals, Policies and Programs in this Housing Element are intended to facilitate the development of affordable housing while balancing the overarching needs of the community – including livability and compatibility – that the ordinance was established to address.</p> <p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Delete; this policy is duplicates Policy 7.7.</p>
<p>Policy 7.11 Evaluate current policies to ensure consistency and compliance with statewide efforts to reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>The County has developed and adopted a Community Climate Action Plan of the Alameda County General Plan which is intended to support the County’s Greenhouse Gas reduction goals.</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 7.9.</p>
<p>Policy 7.12 Promote land development that is consistent with state efforts to reverse climate change.</p>	<p>A key component of the County’s General Plan is the concept of promoting transit-oriented development (TOD). This implies locating housing near transportation corridors, well served by public transportation and with access to goods and services, thus reducing single-</p>	<p><u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u>: Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 7.10.</p>

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
	<p>occupancy vehicle trips, improving neighborhoods, and reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. The County implements TODs through the establishment of four transit-oriented Priority Development Areas.</p> <p>Four PDAs have been approved by the Board of Supervisors, and later by ABAG, for future growth. Each of these areas is accessible to transit, jobs, shopping and other services. Projections from Plan Bay Area state collectively PDAs have the capacity “to absorb about 80 percent of new housing and over 60 percent of new jobs on less than five percent of the Bay Area’s land. The result is a locally supported, compact and efficient growth pattern that meets CARB’s GHG reduction targets and provides adequate housing for the Bay Area’s growing population.” There are currently four PDAs located within Unincorporated Alameda County, they are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E14th Street/Mission Boulevard Corridor • Meekland Avenue Corridor • Hesperian Boulevard Corridor • Castro Valley BART Station Area 	

Implementation	Current Schedule/Status	How Effective was this Program?
Policy 7.13 Adopt and implement a Green Building Ordinance.	The Ordinance was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2009. Staff continues to implement the Ordinance.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Delete; this action has been completed.
Policy 7.14 Participate in county-wide, regional and national efforts that promote sustainable development practices.		<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this implementation step is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element; however, it is now categorized as Policy 7.11.
Green Building Ordinance	The Ordinance was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2009.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Delete; this program has been completed.
Climate Action Team/Action Plan	The County adopted the Community Climate Action Plan in 2011 and incorporated into the General Plan in 2014. Staff has begun work on implementation.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Modify; this program has been completed; however, staff continues to meet to strategize and coordinate implementation. The program has been renamed "Implement the Community Climate Action Plan".
StopWaste.org	Stopwaste.org is active in efforts to reduce waste throughout the County.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program is included in the 2015-23 Housing Element.
Mixed Use and Transit Oriented Developments	In process. The Eden Area Plan was approved in March 2010 and the Castro Valley Plan was adopted in March 2012. Staff is now focused on implementing these two plans. In addition, the County is in the process of revising its Ashland Cherryland Business District Specific Plan. The plan area contains a significant number of parcels zoned for mixed uses and with access to public transit.	<u>Continue/Modify/Delete</u> : Continue; this program has not been completed.

QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES FROM THE PREVIOUS ELEMENT

The quantified objectives from the 2009-14 Housing Element took into account the anticipated funding for subsidized housing, as well as expected building activity throughout the unincorporated areas of the County. The table below provides the current states of the quantified objectives for the unincorporated areas of Alameda County as of the end of 2013. Table B-2 provides a numerical analysis of the County's housing production as compared to its quantified objectives. Table B-2 demonstrates that the County was able to accomplish 53% of its housing goals for the period.

Table B-1: Quantified Objectives and Housing Production Unincorporated Alameda County, 2007-2014

Conservation/ Preservation	Total	VLI	LI	MOD	Notes	Status
Sparksway Commons	44	22	22		Has not converted	Remains at risk
<i>Quantified Objective</i>	44	22	22	0		
Rehabilitation	Total	VLI	LI	MOD	Notes	Status
Single Family Rehabilitation	25			25	Various sites.	14 units completed
Multi-family Rehabilitation	56	0	56		HCD completed the substantial rehabilitation of Sienna Point Apartments (109 units) and the RDA collaborated on the substantial rehabilitation of the Ashland Village (142 units).	251 units completed
<i>Quantified Objective</i>	81	0	56	25		
New Construction	Total	VLI	LI	MOD	Notes	Status
Deed Restricted						
Ashland Family Housing					85 units (84 restricted)	Under Construction
Mercy Senior Housing					77 units (76 restricted)	Entitled 2014
Kent Gardens Senior Apartments					85 units (84 restricted)	Completed 2008
Hayward Village					151 units	Completed 2007
Unrestricted						
Various Projects					28 affordable to low income households; 160 units affordable to moderate income households	Permitted or completed
<i>Quantified Objective</i>	1,276	536	340	400	<i>Based on the County's RHNA</i>	
TOTAL	1,401	558	418	425		

Source: Alameda County Community Development Agency

Table B-2: Quantified Objectives vs. Actual Housing Production 2007-14

	Income Groups				TOTAL
	Very Low	Low	Moderate ⁽¹⁾	Above Moderate	
Conservation/ Preservation	22	22			44
Actual	22	22			44
% of Objective	100%	100%			100%
Rehabilitation		56	25		81
Actual		253	14		267
% of Objective		452%	56%		330%
Construction	536	340	400	891	2,167
Actual	262	133	160	172	900
% of Objective	49%	39%	40%	19%	42%
All Programs	558	418	425	891	2,292
Actual	284	408	174	172	1,211
% of Objective	51%	98%	41%	19%	53%

Source: Alameda County Community Development Agency

Notes:

- (1) Staff analyzed data from the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) Affordability Index from 2007-14 and determined that based on the valuation or purchase price, 160 non-restricted units would have been affordable to households with incomes of up to 120% of the area's median income (moderate income households).

PROGRESS TOWARDS RHNA

Another component of this review is the County's progress toward fulfilling its share of the regional housing needs from January 1, 2007 to December 31, 2013. The County achieved 41% of its RHNA goals for housing affordable to very low and low income households.

Income Groups	RHNA	Units Constructed	Difference	% Achieved
Very Low	536	388	(148)	72%
Low	340	179	(161)	53%
Moderate	400	160	(240)	40%
Above Moderate	891	172	(719)	19%
TOTAL	2,167	899	(1,268)	41%

This page has been intentionally left blank

HOUSING PLAN SUMMARY

Program	Key Objectives	Timeframe	Responsible Agency	Funding Source
<i>Provide Adequate Sites</i>				
Residential Sites Inventory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to provide adequate sites to accommodate the County's RHNA of 1,769 units. 	2015-23	CDA-Planning	General Fund
Web Based Zoning and Planning Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide a centralized, accessible, web based zoning and planning data 	2015	CDA-Planning	General Fund
Annual Progress Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare an annual report for submission to State HCD 	2015-23	CDA-Planning	General Fund
<i>Assist in the Development of Affordable Housing</i>				
Affordable Housing Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop a housing strategy Identify and complete between four to six new affordable housing projects during the planning period 	2015-23; Annually	CDA-HCD and CDA-ECD	HOME, CDBG (Affordable Housing Pool and Rental Rehabilitation Program), Alameda County Affordable Housing Trust Fund
Density Bonus Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to ensure that the County's Ordinance reflects State law. Create brochures and other materials necessary to promote the County's Density Bonus Program to developers. 	2015-2017; Ongoing	CDA-Planning	General Fund
Small Lot Consolidation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote lot consolidation to facilitate housing development 	Ongoing	CDA-Planning	General Fund
Secondary Units	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote the Secondary Unit Program to increase public awareness 	Ongoing	CDA-Planning, Public Works Administration (PWA)-Building Inspections Division (BID)	General Fund, Permit Fees

HOUSING PLAN SUMMARY

Program	Key Objectives	Timeframe	Responsible Agency	Funding Source
Park Fee Waiver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote affordable housing development and ensures financial feasibility 	Ongoing	CDA-Planning	General Fund
HIV/AIDS Housing and Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address the housing and needs of low income people with HIV/AIDS and their families. 	Ongoing	CDA-HCD and the PHD-OAA	HOPWA, CARE, and McKinney-Vento Funds
First Time Homebuyer Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide resources for first time homebuyers 	Ongoing	CDA-HCD	General Fund
Mortgage Credit Certificate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist 40 county-wide (5-7 in the unincorporated County) low and moderate income first time homebuyers in the unincorporated areas. 	Ongoing	CDA-HCD	Mortgage Credit Certificate
Section 8 Housing Programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide rental assistance to 600 extremely low and very low income households in the unincorporated areas during the planning period. 	Ongoing	HACA	HUD - Section 8
Family Self Sufficiency Program (FSS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist 20 Section 8 recipients in the unincorporated areas to achieve self-sufficiency during the planning period. 	Ongoing	HACA	HUD - Section 8, additional public and private funds
Housing Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate housing development for persons with disabilities 	Annually	HCSA, Regional Centers, Planning, CDA-HCD, and	General Fund

HOUSING PLAN SUMMARY

Program	Key Objectives	Timeframe	Responsible Agency	Funding Source
			CDA-ECD	
Housing Opportunities for the Homeless	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitate housing development for homeless persons 	Annually	CDA-HCD, BHCS, Planning, EveryOne Home	General Fund
Affordable Housing Trust Fund "Boomerang" Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the development of affordable housing 	Ongoing	CDA-HCD	General Fund
<i>Address Governmental Constraints</i>				
Ordinance Review Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Periodically review proposed changes to the Alameda County Zoning Ordinance to ensure consistency with the Housing Element law and State and Federal fair housing laws. Ensure that County regulations do not unnecessarily constrain housing development 	Annually	CDA-Planning	General Fund
Environmental Review Streamlining	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the development of housing near transit 	Annually	CDA-Planning	General Fund
Intergovernmental Coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expedite and simplify housing development by improving the efficiency of permit processes 	Annually	CDA-Planning, ACFD, PWA, and others	Planning and Permit Fees
<i>Conserve and Improve Existing Affordable Housing Stock</i>				
Minor Home Repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist 150 lower income households over the planning period. 	Ongoing	CDA-NPS, CDA-HCD and CDA-ECD	CDBG, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside
Accessibility Grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist 20 households over the planning period. 	Ongoing	CDA-NPS, CDA-HCD and CDA-ECD	CDBG, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside
Rehabilitation Loans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assist 14 homeowners during the planning period 	Ongoing	CDA-NPS, CDA-HCD and CDA-ECD	CDBG, Redevelopment Housing Set-Aside

HOUSING PLAN SUMMARY

Program	Key Objectives	Timeframe	Responsible Agency	Funding Source
Foreclosure Prevention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide up to date information about avoiding and dealing with foreclosure. 	Ongoing	CDA-HCD	General Fund
Healthy Homes Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevent childhood lead poisoning and other health-related environmental problems 	Ongoing	Healthy Homes	HUD, EPA, CDC and DHS
Code Enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to enforce applicable sections of the Alameda County Ordinance and related land use regulations 	Ongoing	CDA-Planning, Code Enforcement Division	General Fund and Planning Fees
<i>Preserve Affordable Housing at Risk of Conversion</i>				
Preservation of At Risk Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain a database of subsidized housing units in order to monitor the status of units at risk of conversion Pursue funding from private, State and Federal programs to assist in preserving at risk housing 	2015-23	CDA-HCD and HACA	General Fund, HUD, HOME, and Section 8
Condominium Conversion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to enforce the Condominium Conversion Guidelines 	Ongoing	CDA-Planning, PWA-Development Services	Planning and Permit Fees
<i>Promote Equal Housing Opportunities</i>				
Fair Housing Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce housing discrimination through the provision of fair housing and landlord/tenant services 	Ongoing	CDA-HCD	CDBG
<i>Environmental Sustainability</i>				
StopWaste.org	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide strategic planning, research, education and technical assistance to the public, businesses and local governments on waste reduction 	Ongoing	StopWaste.org	Facilities Fees and fees paid for waste disposal
Infill, Mixed Use and Transit Oriented	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop programs to promote mixed use and 	2015-23	CDA-Planning	General Fund

HOUSING PLAN SUMMARY

Program	Key Objectives	Timeframe	Responsible Agency	Funding Source
Developments	transit oriented developments • Investigate incentives to support mixed use and transit oriented developments			

This page has been intentionally left blank

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Acre: A unit of land equal to 43,560 square feet.

Affordability Restrictions: A property title agreement which places resale or rental restrictions on a housing unit. Also referred to as affordability covenants.

Affordable Housing: Under state and federal statutes, housing which costs no more than 30 to 35 percent of gross household income. Housing costs can be defined differently for renters and includes include rent and utilities. Costs for homeowners include mortgage payments and may also include utilities, taxes, insurance, homeowner association fees, and related costs.

Area Median Income (AMI): The State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) adjusts each county's median family income, as determined by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for its Section 8 Housing Voucher Program, to reflect economic conditions in each county in the State. AMI is used to set affordability levels for State housing programs, and is revised annually.

Assisted Housing: Housing that has received subsidies (such as low interest loans, density bonuses, direct financial assistance, etc.) by federal, state, or local housing programs in exchange for restrictions requiring a certain number of housing units to be affordable to very low, low, and moderate income households.

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG): The regional government agency authorized by the federal and state government to address regional planning issues in the nine Bay Area Counties.

At-Risk Housing: Assisted rental housing that is at risk of losing its status as housing affordable for very low-, low-, and moderate-income residents due to the expiration of federal, state or local agreements.

California Department of Housing and Community Development (State HCD): The State department responsible for administering State-sponsored housing programs and for reviewing housing elements to determine compliance with State housing law.

Census: The official decennial enumeration of the population conducted by the federal government.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG): A grant program administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). This program allots money to cities and counties for housing rehabilitation and community development activities, including public facilities and economic development.

Condominium: A building or group of buildings in which units are owned individually, but the structure, common areas and facilities are owned by all owners on a proportional, undivided basis.

Density: The number of dwelling units per unit of land. Density usually is expressed "per acre," e.g., a development with 100 units located on 20 acres has density of 5.0 units per acre.

Density Bonus: The allowance of additional residential units beyond the maximum for which the parcel is otherwise permitted usually in exchange for the provision of affordable housing units at the same site.

Development Impact Fees: A fee or charge imposed on developers to pay for a jurisdiction's costs of providing services to new development.

Development Right: The right granted to a land owner or other authorized party to improve a property. Such right is usually expressed in terms of a use and intensity allowed under the existing zoning regulation. For example, a development right may specify the maximum number of residential dwelling units permitted per acre of land. Also referred to as entitlements.

Dwelling Unit: One or more rooms, designed, occupied or intended for occupancy as separate living quarters, with cooking, sleeping and sanitary facilities provided within the unit for the exclusive use of a household.

Dwelling, Multifamily: A building containing two or more dwelling units for the use of individual households; an apartment or condominium building is an example of this dwelling unit type.

Dwelling, Single family Attached: A one-family dwelling attached to one or more other one-family dwellings by a common vertical wall. Row houses and town homes are examples of this dwelling unit type.

Dwelling, Single-family Detached: A dwelling, not attached to any other dwelling, which is designed for and occupied by not more than one family and is surrounded by open space or yards.

Elderly Household: Elderly households are (family or non-family) households in which the head is age 65 or older. Elderly households may also be referred to as senior households.

Element: A division of the General Plan.

Emergency Shelter: An emergency shelter is a facility that provides shelter to homeless families and/or homeless individuals on a limited short-term basis.

Emergency Shelter Grants (ESG): A grant program administered by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) provided on a formula basis to large entitlement jurisdictions.

Entitlement Jurisdiction: A local jurisdiction, which based on its population, is entitled to receive funding directly from HUD. Examples of entitlement programs include CDBG, HOME and ESG. An entitlement city must have a population of 50,000 or more. An entitlement Urban County must have a population of 200,000 or more, including residents in the unincorporated areas and in small cities that do not independently qualify as entitlement cities (with less than 50,000 residents).

Fair Market Rent (FMR): Fair Market Rents (FMRs) are freely set rental rates defined by HUD as the median gross rents charged for available standard units in a county or Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). Fair Market Rents are used for the Section 8 Rental

Program and other HUD programs.

First-Time Home Buyer: Defined by HUD as an individual or family who has not owned a home during the three-year period preceding the purchase of a home. Jurisdictions may adopt local definitions for first-time home buyer programs which differ from non-federally funded programs.

General Plan: The General Plan is a legal document, adopted by the legislative body of a City or County, setting forth policies regarding long-term development. California law requires the preparation of seven elements or chapters in the General Plan: Land Use, Housing, Circulation, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, and Safety.

Group Quarters: A facility which houses groups of unrelated persons not living in households (U.S. Census definition). Examples of group quarters include institutions, dormitories, shelters, military quarters, assisted living facilities and other quarters, including single-room occupancy

HOME Program: The HOME Investment Partnership Act, Title II of the National Affordable Housing Act of 1990 is a Federal program administered by HUD which provides formula grants to States and localities to fund activities that build, buy, and/or rehabilitate affordable housing for rent or home ownership or provide direct rental assistance to low-income people.

Homeless: Unsheltered homeless are families and individuals whose primary nighttime residence is a public or private place not designed for, or ordinarily used as, a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings (e.g., the street, sidewalks, cars, vacant and abandoned buildings). Sheltered homeless are families and persons whose primary nighttime residence is a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter (e.g., emergency, transitional, battered women, and homeless youth shelters; and commercial hotels or motels used to house the homeless).

Household: The US Census Bureau defines a household as all persons living in a housing unit whether or not they are related. A single person living in an apartment as well as a family living in a house is considered a household. Households do not include individuals living in dormitories, prisons, convalescent homes, or other group quarters.

Household Income: The total income of all the persons living in a household. Household income is commonly grouped into income categories based upon household size, and income, relative to the area median family income.

The following categories are used in the Housing Element:

Extremely Low-: Households earning less than 30% of County median family income

Very Low-: Households earning less than 50% of County median family income

Low-: Households earning 51% to 80% of the County median family income

Moderate-: Households earning 81% to 120% of County median family income

Above Moderate-: Households earning above 120% of County median family income

Housing Problems: Defined by HUD as a household that: (1) occupies a unit with physical defects (lacks complete kitchen or bathroom); (2) meets the definition of overcrowded; or (3) spends more than 30% of income on housing cost.

Housing Stock: All housing units, occupied or vacant, located in a specific geographic area.

Housing Subsidy: Housing subsidies refer to government assistance aimed at reducing housing sales or rent prices to more affordable levels.

Housing Unit: A room or group of rooms used by one or more individuals living separately from others in the structure, with direct access to the outside or to a public hall and containing separate toilet and kitchen facilities.

Large Household: A household with 5 or more members.

Manufactured Housing: Housing that is constructed of manufactured components, assembled partly at the site rather than totally at the site. Also referred to as modular housing.

Market-Rate Housing: Housing which is available on the open market without any subsidy of which the price for housing is determined by the market forces of supply and demand.

Median Income: The annual income for each household size within a region which is defined annually by HUD. Half of the households in the region have incomes above the median and half have incomes below the median.

Mobile Home: A structure, transportable in one or more sections, which is at least 8 feet in width and 32 feet in length, is built on a permanent chassis and designed to be used as a dwelling unit when connected to the required utilities, either with or without a permanent foundation.

Modular Housing: Housing constructed of manufactured components and partially assembled at the site. Also referred to as manufactured housing or factory built housing.

Overcrowding: As defined by the U.S. Census, a household with greater than 1.01 persons per room, excluding bathrooms, kitchens, hallways, and porches. Severe overcrowding is defined as households with greater than 1.51 persons per room.

Overpayment or Cost Burden: The extent to which gross housing costs, including utility costs, exceed 30 percent of gross household income, based on data published by the U.S. Census Bureau. Severe overpayment, or cost burden, exists if gross housing costs exceed 50 percent of gross income.

Parcel: The basic unit of land entitlement. A designated area of land established by plat, subdivision, or otherwise legally defined and permitted to be used, or built upon.

Redevelopment Agency: California Community Redevelopment Law had authorized jurisdictions to establish a Redevelopment Agency with the scope and financing mechanisms necessary to remedy blight and provide stimulus to eliminate deteriorated conditions. ABx1 26 dissolved all California redevelopment agencies (RDAs) effective October 1, 2011. This legislation prevented RDAs from engaging in new activities and outlined a process for winding down the RDA's financial affairs. It also set forth a process for distributing funds from the former RDAs to other local taxing entities.

Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan (RHNA): The Regional Housing Needs Assessment is based on the share of the region's future housing need that is assigned to each jurisdiction within the ABAG area. These housing needs numbers serve as the basis for the

update of the Housing Element.

Rehabilitation: The upgrading of a building previously in a dilapidated or substandard condition for human habitation or use.

Rural: areas that are located outside of the Urban Growth Boundary as provided in the East County Area Plan as amended by Measure D.

Second Unit: A dwelling unit accessory to a main single-family dwelling on a parcel of land and which meets the requirements of XI-10-13.08 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 8 Rental Voucher/Certificate Program: A tenant-based rental assistance program that subsidizes a family's rent in a privately owned house or apartment. The program is administered by Housing Authority of the County of Alameda residents. Assistance payments are based on 30 percent of household annual income. Households with incomes of 50 percent or below the area median income are eligible to participate in the program.

Service Needs: The particular services required by special populations, typically including needs such as transportation, personal care, housekeeping, counseling, meals, case management, personal emergency response, and other services preventing premature institutionalization and assisting individuals to continue living independently.

Single Room Occupancy (SRO): A SRO is a cluster of residential units of a smaller size than normally found in multiple dwellings within a residential hotel, motel, or facility providing sleeping or living facilities in which sanitary facilities may be provided within the unit and/or shared, and kitchen or cooking facilities may be provided within the unit or shared within the housing project.

Special Needs Groups: Those segments of the population which have a more difficult time finding decent affordable housing due to special circumstances. Under California Housing Element statutes, these special needs groups consist of the elderly, people with disabilities, large families with five or more members, female-headed households with children, farmworkers and the homeless.

Specific Plan: A specific plan covers a defined portion of a jurisdiction and is incorporated into the County's General Plan. Detailed information regarding design guidelines and implementation steps may be included in a Specific Plan.

Subdivision: The division of a lot, tract or parcel of land in accordance with the Subdivision Map Act (California Government Code Section 66410 et seq.).

Substandard Housing: Housing which does not meet the minimum standards in State Housing Code. Jurisdictions may adopt more stringent local definitions of substandard housing. Substandard units which are structurally sound and for which the cost of rehabilitation is economically warranted are considered suitable for rehabilitation. Substandard units which are structurally unsound and for which the cost of rehabilitation is considered infeasible are considered in need of replacement.

Supportive Housing: Housing with a supporting environment, such as group homes or single room occupancy (SRO) housing and other housing that includes a supportive service component such as those defined below.

Supportive Services: Services provided to residents of supportive housing for the purpose of facilitating the independence of residents. Some examples are case management, medical or psychological counseling and supervision, child care, transportation, and job training.

Transitional Housing: Transitional housing is temporary (often six months to two years) housing for a homeless individual or family who is transitioning to permanent housing. Transitional housing often includes a supportive services component (e.g. job skills training, rehabilitation counseling, etc.) to allow individuals to gain necessary life skills in support of independent living.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD): The cabinet level department of the federal government responsible for housing, housing assistance, and urban development at the national level. Housing programs administered through HUD include Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME and Section 8, among others.

Urban: areas that are located within the Urban Growth Boundary as provided in the County General Plan as amended by Measure D and which permit densities greater than 1 dwelling unit per acre.

Zoning: A land use regulatory measure enacted by local government. Zoning district regulations governing lot size, building bulk, placement, and other development standards vary from district to district, but must be uniform within the same district. Each city and county adopts a zoning ordinance specifying these regulations.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AB	Assembly Bill
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
ACS	American Community Survey, U.S. Census
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
AHS	American Housing Survey, U.S. Census
ALUC	Airport Land Use Committee
AMI	Area Median Income
BHCS	Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services
CalWORKs	California Work Opportunities and Responsibility for Kids
CDA	Alameda County Community Development Agency
CDBG	Community Development Block Grant
CDP	Census Designated Place
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CHAS	Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy
CUP	Conditional Use Permit
DIF	Development Impact Fee
DMG	State Division of Mines and Geology
DPH	Alameda County Department of Public Health
du/ac	dwelling unit per acre
EBMUD	East Bay Municipal Utility District
EBRPD	East Bay Regional Parks District
ECAP	East County Area Plan
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
ECD	Alameda County Economic and Community Development Department
ESG	Emergency Shelter Grant
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FMR	Fair Market Rent
FY	Fiscal Year
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
HACA	Housing Authority of the County of Alameda
HARD	Hayward Area Recreational and Parks District
HCD	County Housing and Community Development Department
HOME	Home Investment Partnership Program
HOPWA	Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
LIHTC	Low Income Housing Tax Credit
MCC	Mortgage Credit Certificate
MFI	Median Family Income
MSA	Metropolitan Statistical Area
NOFA	Notice of Funding Availability
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NSP	Neighborhood Stabilization Program
PWA	Alameda County Public Works Agency
RDA	Alameda County Redevelopment Agency

RFP	Request for Proposal
RHNA	Regional Housing Needs Assessment
SB	Senate Bill
SDR	Site Development Review
SEA	Significant Ecological Area
SHMA	Seismic Hazards Mapping Act
SHP	Supportive Housing Program
SRO	Single Room Occupancy housing unit
State HCD	California Department of Housing and Community Development
TOD	Transit Oriented Development
Zone 7	Zone 7 Water Agency

SOURCES

The Alameda County Housing Element Update utilized data from the following sources:

- Alameda County Community Development Agency and Public Works Agency, Geographic Information Systems
- Alameda County Community Development Agency and Public Works Agency, Electronic Development and Permit Tracking System
- Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development, Consolidated Plan
- Alameda County General and Specific Plans:
 - Ashland and Cherryland Business Districts Specific Plan, 1993 (Under Revision)
 - Castro Valley Central Business District Specific Plan, 1994
 - Fairview Area Specific Plan, 1997 (Under Revisions)
 - Madison Avenue Specific Plan, 2006
 - San Lorenzo Village Center Specific Plan, 2004
 - Eden Area General Plan, 2010
 - Castro Valley General Plan, 2012
- Alameda County Housing Element (2009-14)
- Alameda County Ordinance Code: Title 16 (Subdivisions) and Title 17 (Planning and Zoning)
- Alameda County Public Works Administration, Flood and Alquist-Priolo Zone Maps
- Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2013
- Association of Bay Area Governments, San Francisco Bay Area Housing Needs Plan: 2014-2022, 2013
- California Department of Finance
- California Department of Housing and Community Development
- California Employment Development Department
- California Government Code
- California Housing Partnership Corporation
- DQNews, www.dqnews.com
- U.S. Census Bureau, Census 1990, 2000, and 2010
- Comprehensive Housing Affordability Study (CHAS) Data, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

The following is a list of Qualified Entities pursuant to Government Code Section 65863.11 from the list maintained by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (State HCD). Qualified entities are those persons or organizations that have expressed an interest in participating in programs that preserve affordable housing units at risk of conversion to market rate. Parties wishing to be included in this listing are strongly encouraged to contact the

Organization	Address	City	ST	Zip	Phone Number	Contact Person	E-Mail Address
Alameda County Allied Housing Program	224 W. Winton Avenue, Room 108	Hayward	CA	94541	(510) 670-5404		
Asian Neighborhood Design	461 Bush St 4th Flr	San Francisco	CA	94108	(415) 982-2959	Ada Chan	ADA@ANDNET.ORG
Bay Area Community Services	P. O. Box 2269	Alameda	CA	94621	(510) 613-0330	Susan Garbuio	BACS@pacbell.net
C. Sandidge and Associates	2200 San Pablo Ave # 202	Pinole	CA	94564-1746	(510) 964-0916	Cherene Sandidge	
Christian Church Homes of Northern California, Inc.	303 Hegenberger Road, Ste. 201	Oakland	CA	94621-1419	(510) 632-6714	William F. Pickel	bpickel@cchnc.org
Community and Economic Development Agency	250 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza Ste. 5313	Oakland	CA	94612	(510) 238-3502	Jefferey P. Levin	jplevin@oaklandnet.com
Community Development Corporation of Oakland	5636 Shattuck Avenue	Oakland	CA	94609	(510) 428-9345	Larry Taylor	
Community Home Builders and Associates	675 North First St., Ste. 620	San Jose	CA	95112	(408) 977-1726	Mark D. Lazzarini	MLAZZ@MSN.COM
Community Housing Developers, Inc.	255 N. Market Street, Suite 290	San Jose	CA	95110	408) 279-7677		
East Bay Asian Local Development Corporation	310 Eighth Street, Ste. 200	Oakland	CA	94607	(510) 287-5353	Lynette Jung Lee	ljunglee@ebaldc.com
Eden Housing, Inc.	409 Jackson St	Hayward	CA	94544	(510) 582-1460	Catherine A. Merschel	Cmerschel@edenhousing.org
Housing Authority of City of Alameda	701 Atlantic Ave	Alameda	CA	94501	(510) 747-4300	Michael T. Pucci	mpucci@alamedahsg.org
Housing Authority of County of Alameda	22941 Atherton St	Hayward	CA	94541	(510) 538-8876	Ophelia B. Basgal	obasgal@aol.com
Housing Corporation of America	31423 Coast Highway, Ste. 7100	Laguna Beach	CA	92677	(323) 726-9672	Carol Cromar	HCACCROMAR@DESSRETONLINE.COM
Livermore Housing Authority	3203 Leahy Way	Livermore	CA	94550	(925) 447-3600	Jon D. Hovey	livhsg@prodigy.net
Nehemiah Progressive Housing Dev. Corp.	1851 Heritage Lane, Ste. 201	Sacramento	CA	95860	(916) 231-1999	Kenneth Watkins	projmng@nahemiahprogram.org

Organization	Address	City	ST	Zip	Phone Number	Contact Person	E-Mail Address
Northern California Land Trust, Inc.	3122 Shattuck Avenue	Berkeley	CA	94705	(510) 548-7878		
Petaluma Ecumenical Properties Inc.	1400 Caulfield Lane	Petaluma	CA	94954	(707) 762-2336	Vera R. Ciammetti	
Resources for Community Development	2131 University Ave #224	Berkeley	CA	94704	(510) 841-4410	Dan Sawislak	resdevcom@aol.com
ROEM Development Corporation	1650 Lafayette Circle	Santa Clara	CA	65050	(408) 984-5600	Jonathan Emami	
Satellite Affordable Housing Associates	1521 University Avenue	Berkeley	CA	94703	(510) 647-0700	Susan Friedland	
3R Real Estate	3605 Long Beach Blvd.	Long Beach	CA	90807	(562) 989-3730	Gary Kammer	gkammer@fairviewinc.com
A. F. Evans Development, Inc.	1000 Broadway #300	Oakland	CA	94607	(510) 891-9400	Craig Adelman	
Affordable Community Housing Trust	7901 La Riviera Drive	Sacramento	CA	95826	(916) 381-2001	M. McClenaghan	calum@speedlink.com
Allied Pacific Development, LLC	169 Saxony Road, Suite 103	Encinitas	CA	92024	(760) 557-1480		
Alpha Property Management, Inc.	1755 East Martin Luther King Blvd.	Los Angeles	CA	90058	(323) 231-4174	Francis Rath	frath@alphaproperty.com
American Baptist Homes of the West	6120 Stoneridge Mall Road, 3rd Flr.	Pleasanton	CA	94588	(925) 924-7100	Ancel Romero	
American Communities, LLC	250 N. Harbor Drive, No. 319	Redondo Beach	CA	90277	(310) 798-5656	Frank Fonseca	
Amerland Communities, LLC	2878 Camino Del Rio S., Ste. 100	San Diego	CA	92108	(619) 497-3075	Jules Arthur	JULES@AMERLAND.BZ
Bank of America, N.A.	555 California St., 6th Floor	San Francisco	CA	94104	(415) 953-2631	Gabriel Speyer	
Belveron Real Estate Partners, LLC	268 Bush St., #3534	San Francisco	CA	94104	(415) 273-6801		
Bentall Residential, LLC	8105 Irvine Center Drive, Suite830	Irvine	CA	92618	(949) 753-0555	Ken Reiner	
Beyond Shelter Housing Development Corp.	3255 Wilshire Blvd. Ste. 815	Los Angeles	CA	90010	(213) 251-2111	Andrea Davis	
Brian L. Fitterer, Inc.	4770 Campus Drive, No. 200	Newport Beach	CA	92660	(949) 862-1500	Brian Fitterer	BLFINC862@garthlink.net

Organization	Address	City	ST	Zip	Phone Number	Contact Person	E-Mail Address
BRIDGE Housing Corporation	345 Spear Strett, Suite 700	San Francisco	CA	94105	(415) 989-1111	Brad Wiblin	
Bridge Partners	2950 Buskirk Ave., Ste. 312	Walnut Creek	CA	94597	(925) 457-256-3448x13	Julie Gutzwiller	gutzwiller@bridgepartners.com
BUILD Leadership Development, Inc.	P.O. Box 9414	Newport Beach	CA	92658	(877) 644-9422	Tracy Green	
Cabouchon Properties, LLC	Pier 9, Suite 114	San Francisco	CA	94111	(415) 433-2000	Susan Terrado	
California Coalition for Rural Housing	717 K Street, Suite 400	Sacramento	CA	95814	(916) 443-4448	Dewey Bandy	DBandy@calruralhousing.org
California Commercial Investment Group	4530 E. Thousand Oaks Blvd., Sute 100	Westlake Village	CA	91362	(805) 495-8400		
California Community Reinvestment Corp.	225 West Broadway, Ste. 120	Glendale	CA	91204	(818) 550-9800	George Vine	
California Housing Finance Agency	100 Corporate Pointe, Suite 250	Culver City	CA	90230	(310) 342-5415	Margaret Alvarez	malvarez@calhfa.ca.gov
California Housing Finance Agency	P.O. Box 4034	Sacramento	CA	95812-4034	(916) 326-8801	Bob Deaner	bdeaner@calhfa.ca.gov
California Housing Finance Agency	500 Capitol Mall, Suite 400	Sacramento	CA	95814	(916) 326-8801	Bob Deaner	bdeaner@calhfa.ca.gov
California Housing Partnership Corporation	369 Pine Street, Suite 300	San Francisco	CA	94104	(415) 433-6804	Matt Schwartz	mwacks@chpc.net
California Human Development Corporation	3315 Airway Drive	Santa Rosa	CA	95403	(707) 523-1155	George Ortiz	
Chelsea Investment Corporation	725 South Coast Highway 101	Encinitas	CA	92024	(760) 456-6000	Jim Schmid	
Citizens Housing Corp	26 O'Farrell St. #506	San Francisco	CA	94108	(415) 421-8605	Norrie Boyd, James Buckley	home@citizenshousing.org
Community Development & Preservation, LLC	1925 Century Park East, Ste. 1900	Los Angeles	CA	90067	(310) 208-1888	Charles L. Schewennesen	
Community Housing Assistance Program, Inc.	3803 E. Casselle Ave	Orange	CA	92869	(714) 744-6252	Ken Robertson	chapahq1@aol.com
Community Housing Works	4305 Univeristy Ave. Suite 550	San Diego	CA	92105	(619) 282-6647	Anne Wilson	

Organization	Address	City	ST	Zip	Phone Number	Contact Person	E-Mail Address
Corporation for Better Housing	15303 Ventura Blvd., Suite 1100	Sherman Oaks	CA	91403	(818) 905-2430 x106	Mary Silverstein	
Creative Housing Coalition	4612 Alta Canyada Road	La Canada	CA	91011	(805) 736-9342	Jane Anderson	
Dawson Holdings, Inc.	300 Turney Street, 2nd Floor	Sausalito	CA	94965	(801) 244-6658	Tim Fluetsch	
DML & Associates Foundation	6043 Tampa Ave, Ste. 101A	Tarzana	CA	91356	(818) 708-2710	Myron Lieberman	
Domus Development, LLC	594 Howard St., Ste 204	San Francisco	CA	94105	(415) 856-0010	Meea Kang	
EAH, Inc.	2169 E. Francisco Blvd., Ste. B	San Rafael	CA	94901	(415) 258-1800	Alvin Bonnett	ab@eah.org
East Los Angeles Community Corporation	530 South Boyle Avenue	Los Angeles	CA	90033	(323) 269-4214	Ernesto Espinoza	
Episodes International, LLC	3480 Torrance Blvd., Suite 100	Torrance	CA	90503	(310) 971-8046	Fearl Sharayne Chatman	
Fairfied Residential LLC	5510 Morehouse Drive, Suite 200	San Diego	CA	92121	(858) 824-6406	Paul Kudirka	pkudirka@ffres.com
Fallbrook Capital Corporation	6700 Fallbrook Avenue, #111	West Hills	CA	91307	(818) 712-6931	Brandt Blaken	
Foundation for Affordable Housing III, Inc.	2600 Michelson Dr, Ste. 1050	Irvine	CA	92612	(949) 440-8277	Tom or Deborah Willard	willard@home.com
Foundation for Affordable Housing, Inc.	30950 Rancho Viejo Road, Suite 100	San Juan Capistrano	CA	92675	(949) 443-9101	Wallace K. Shepherd	Afrdblhsng@aol.com
Goldrich & Kest Industries, LLC	5150 Overland Avenue	Culver City	CA	90230	(310) 204-2050	Carole Glodney	Carole@Gkind.com
GWR Homes, Inc.	1445 Huntington Drive, #200	South Pasadena	CA	91030	(626) 441-5900	Lynda Murray Thomas	
Hampstead Development Group, Inc.	3413 30th Street	San Diego	CA	92104	(619) 543-4200	Chris Foster	
Hampstead Partners, Inc.	1205 Prospect Street	La Jolla	CA	92037	(858) 456-6500	Jefferson E. Jallo	jeff@hampstead.com
HELP Development Corp.	30 East 33rd St	New York City	NY	10016	(212) 779-3350	John Maneval	hdcproperties@worldnet.att.net
Hendricks & Partners	3100 Zinfindel Drive, Suite 100	Rancho Cordova	CA	65970	(916) 638-5000	Al Inouye	ivansteyn@hpapts.com

Organization	Address	City	ST	Zip	Phone Number	Contact Person	E-Mail Address
Highland Pacific Development Company	3230 Eastlake Avenue, Ste. B	Seattle	WA	98102	(206) 568-6566	Matthew J. Campbell	
Insight Development	No contact information provided					Wah Chen	
Joshua's House	24111 NE Halsey St., Ste. 203	Troutdale	OR	97060	(503) 661-1999	Mark Miles	mark@joshuashouse.org
KDF Communities, LLC	1301 Dove St., Suite 720	Newport Beach	CA	92660	(949) 622-1888 x 207	John Bernard	
Linc Housing Corporation	100 Pine Avenue, # 500	Long Beach	CA	90802	(562) 684-1100	Hunter L. Johnson	
Maximus Properties, LLC	23586 Calabasas Road, Ste. 103	Calabasas	CA	91302	(818)449-4004	Jeffrey S. McGuire	jmcguire@remax.net
MBK Management Corporation	23586 Calabasas Road, Ste. 100	Los Angeles	CA	91302	(818) 222-2800	Mark Kanter	mkanter@crllc.com
Mercy Housing California	1360 Mission St., Suite 300	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-355-7160	Janet Falk	jfalk@mercyhousing.org
Mercy Housing, Inc.	601 18th Avenue, Ste. 150	Denver	CO	80203	(303) 830-3374	Chuck Wehrwein/Jocelyn Rodda	cwehrwein@mercyhousing.org or jrodda....
Mesa Realty Advisors	56 Cbana Blanca	Henderson	NV	89012	(310) 213-5310	Rick W. Toney	
Mill Rock Capital, LLLC	4 Embarcadero Center, 3rd Floor	San Francisco	CA		(415) 730-7126	Brent Reid	
Monica Munoz			CA				
National Affordable Housing Trust	2335 North Bank Drive	Columbus	OH	43220	(614) 451-9929	Robert Snow	bsnow@naht.org
National Church Residences	2335 North Bank Drive	Columbus	OH	43220	(614) 451-2151	John E. Stock	jstock@ncr.org
National Housing Development Corporation	10621 Civic Center Drive, First Floor	Rancho Cucamonga	CA	91730	(909) 291-1400	David Garcia	dgarcia@NHDC.org
National Housing Trust	P.O. Box 3458	Walnut Creek	CA	94598	(925) 945-1774	Donna Kelley	dKelley@NHTINC.ORG
Newport Development, LLC	9 Cushing, Ste. 200	Irvine	CA	92618	(949) 923-7812	Warren Allen	
OSM Investment Company	5155 Rosecrans Avenue, Ste. 120	Hawthorne	CA	90250	(310) 676-0451	Michael Orwitz	osm@earthlink.net
Palm Desert Development Company	PO Box 3958	Palm Desert	CA	92261	(760) 568-1048	Karen Merritt	

Organization	Address	City	ST	Zip	Phone Number	Contact Person	E-Mail Address
Pangaea Real Estate, Inc.	P.O. Box 9415	Newport Beach	CA	92658	(775) 854-4332	Tracy Green	
Paramount Financial Group, Inc.	1655 North Main Street, Suite 220	Walnut Creek	CA	94596	(800) 850-0694	Scott Fricker	sfricker@paramountwest.com
Petaluma Ecumenical Properties Inc.	1400 Caulfield Lane	Petaluma	CA	94954	(707) 762-2336	Vera R. Ciammetti	
Preservation Partners Development	21515 Hawthorne Blvd. Suite 125	Torrance	CA	90503-6514	(310) 802-6681	Kelly Boyer	
Primoris Equity Group LLC	120 S. Harbor Blvd	Anaheim	CA	92805	(855) 482-6624	Angelo Casino	
Related Companies of California	18201 Von Karman Ave. Ste. 400	Irvine	CA	92612	(949)660-7272	William Witte	Bwitte@related.com3
Renaissance Housing Communities	110 Pacific Avenue, Suite 292	San Francisco	CA	94111	(415)0419-4027	David Silver	
Resources for Community Development	2730 Telegraph Ave	Berkeley	CA	94705	(510). 841.4410	Dan Sawislak	www.rcdhousing.org
Retirement Housing Foundation	5150 E. Pacific Coast HWY., Ste. 600	Long Beach	CA	90804	(562) 597-5541	Dr. Laverne R. Joseph	drjoseph@rhf.org
Richman Group of California, LLC.	21520 Yorba Linda Blvd, Suite G-548	Yorba Linda	CA	92887	(714) 837-6138	Pamela Mikus	MikusP@therichmangroup.com
Scott Williams	No contact information provided						
Shelem, Inc	24111 NE Halsey St., Ste. 202	Troutdale	OR	97060	(503) 661-1999	Mark Miles	mark@shelem.org
Skyline Real Estate Development & Acquisitions, Inc.	P.O. Box 7613	Newport Beach	CA	92658	(949) 293-4705	Lynn Miller	skylinerealestate@cox.net
SLSM, LLC	651 29th St.	San Francisco	CA	94101	(415) 826-0301	Stephen Matton	mattoon@ix.netcom.com
Solari Enterprises, Inc.	1544 W. Yale Ave	Orange	CA	92687	(714) 282-2520	Bruce Solari	solari@solari-ent.com
Squier Properties, LLC	1157 Lake Street	Venice	CA	90291	(310) 418-6389	Scott Richards	gsquier@earthlink.net
Steadfast Properties and Development, Inc.	20411 S.W. Birch Street, Ste.. 200	Newport Beach	CA	92660-1797	(949) 852-0700	Sarah Metherell	smetherell@SteadfastCompanies.com
Survivors of Assault Recovery	6333 College Grove Way F3	San Diego	CA	92115	(619) 582-4914	Joyce Edge	
SWJ Housing	PO Box 815	Sebastopol	CA	95473	(707) 823-9884	Scott Johnson	
The John Stewert Company	1388 Sutter St., 11th Floor	San Francisco	CA	94109	(415) 345-4400	Jack Gardner	jscosf@jsco.net

Organization	Address	City	ST	Zip	Phone Number	Contact Person	E-Mail Address
The Trinity Housing Foundation	836 Avalon Ave	Lafayette	CA	94549	(925) 385-0754	Bill Leone	bleone@apr.com
Townspeople, Inc.	3960 Park Blvd	San Diego	CA	92115	(916) 327-2643	Jon P. Derryberry	www.townspeople.com
Treadstone Housing , LLC	1010 2nd Avenue, Suite 1040	San Diego	CA	92101	(619) 794-2200	Courtney D. Allen	
Union Partners Realty Group, Inc.	24 Professional Center, Ste. 250	San Rafael	CA	94903	(415) 446-1811	Michael McDonnell	UPRG@aol.com
USA Properties Fund	2440 Professional Drive	Roseville	CA	95661	(916) 773-5866	Geoffrey C. Brown	
Wakeland Housing & Community Development	625 Broadway, Ste. 1000	San Diego	CA	92010	(619) 235-2296	Ken Sauder	
West Bay Housing Corporation	1390 Market Street, Ste. 405	San Francisco	CA	94102	(415) 618-0012	Bill Pickel	
William G. Ayyad, Inc.	9252 Chesepeake Dr., Suite 100	San Diego	CA	92123	(858) 244-0900 x 103	Jamo Kennedy	
WNC Community Preservation Partners, LLC	17782 Sky Park Circle	Irvine	CA	92620	(714) 662-5565 x 278		

This page has been intentionally left blank

COMMENTS MADE DURING PUBLIC HEARINGS

Planning Commission Hearing – February 3, 2014

Ms. Robinson-Piñon presented the staff report. The Commission discussed the following: changes in the RHNA numbers from the previous planning period; the impact of Measure D, the revision time frame; subcommittee vs. Committee of the Whole (Commission opted for the latter); and, future meeting dates/times. *No public testimony was submitted and no action was taken.*

Planning Commission Hearing – March 17, 2014

Ms. Robinson-Piñon presented the staff report. A discussion followed regarding Chapter 2--relationship to the Design Guidelines, Initiatives (SB 375...etc), incentives, process, density bonuses; Chapter 3--updates/corrections, proposed sites for San Lorenzo vs. Castro Valley. Perhaps a reference to prior Housing Element trends (RHNA, development...), future policy discussion on the sites inventory, perhaps a column titled PDA to be added to table; Chapter V--possible plan up-dates (Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans). *No action was taken.*

Planning Commission Hearing – May 5, 2014

Ms. Robinson-Piñon presented the staff report. The Commission discussed the omission of page 37 (pages 34-36 included in error, previously reviewed); inclusion of Planned Development Findings under 'The PD' (last bullet, page 36); cross reference between the housing units and population and job growths (Tables I-2 & 1-35); and, omission of job created projections re population growth. *No action was taken.*

Planning Commission Hearing – June 2, 2014

Ms. Robinson-Piñon presented the staff report. The Commission requested clarification regarding page 36, 2nd last paragraph; page 43 Table I-53; last sentence on page 44--Table I-54 (to read I-55); page 46, 3rd paragraph, to reflect 'including East County'; and page 28 Table I-38 (Lacking complete plumbing facilities, ...kitchen facilities...etc) and perhaps the final Housing Element to reflect what progress has been made on reducing deficiencies in housing stock. *No action was taken.*

Planning Commission Hearing – July 21, 2014

Ms. Robinson-Piñon presented the staff report noting a typo error on page 13, Policy 3.10 (deletion of the first sentence). The Commission requested clarifications re Policy 1.8 (page 2), Environmental Review Streamlining (page 14) and Policies 2.1, 2.9 (architectural barriers) & 2.10. Commissioner Moore recommended a handout/checklist for increased visibility regarding Policy 2.10 and perhaps examples regarding Policy 2.9. *No action was taken.*

Planning Commission Hearing – October 6, 2014

Ms. Robinson Piñon presented the staff report and Mr. Lopez provided an update on RHNA. A discussion followed re housing distribution, Site Inventory-Vacant Parcels, page 56 (location of sites)--perhaps replace the word 'Vacant'; Policy 2.11 (page 7)-- reflect supporting State efforts to replace affordable housing funds; add '--consistent with County zoning' to Policy 2.25;

perhaps adding Policy 2.26 Boomerang Funds (from page 15); inclusion of program details under Local, page 30; Table III-7 and III-8 – deletion of Park Dedication column; and, Table III-11 to include 4% interest rate. *No action was taken.*

Planning Commission Hearing – November 17, 2014

Ms. Robinson-Piñon presented the staff report. No public comments were submitted. *No action was taken and the matter was continued.*

Planning Commission Hearing – March 15, 2015

Ms. Robinson-Piñon presented the staff report. Public testimony was taken. Comments focused on the conditions of approval imposed by the Alameda County Fire Department as a possible governmental constraint to housing development and the need to involve the public in discussions on how to ensure that these requirements are not excessive. The Commission requested that staff discuss the Bay Fair BART PDA and make modifications to Appendix B "Evaluation of the Prior Element". In addition, Commissioner Ready expressed her opposition to Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in San Lorenzo Village and her concerns over the impact of PDAs in the Eden Area.

COMMENTS SUBMITTED VIA EMAIL

Marc Crawford

Comments submitted June 8, 2014. Letter is attached.

Howard Beckman

-----Original Message-----

From: Howard Beckman [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, December 20, 2014 10:03 PM
To: Lopez, Albert, CDA
Subject: Housing Element

I finally got around to browsing through the draft Housing Element. On page 99, in a paragraph on setbacks, there is the following statement:
"A developer may choose to rezone the parcel to a planned development (PD) district to maximize the lot's development potential." I was astonished to read this in light of the lengthy reexamination of PDs a few years ago. At the core of that reexamination was the history of abuse of the PD district in Alameda County, whereby zoning standards were circumvented by a loose application of the PD district in order to allow a property owner to "maximize" development. This path was never contemplated in the definition of the PD district (see zoning code and the more common understanding and use of the PD throughout the state).

How can this paragraph be improved to avoid such a misstatement and encouragement of a return to old abuses?

Marc Crawford

From: Marc Crawford [REDACTED]

Sent: Monday, March 16, 2015 11:45 AM

To: Loisel, Alane, Planning Commission; Ratto, Lawrence, Planning Commission; Ready, Kathie, Planning Commission; Imhof, Frank, Planning Commission; Moore, Jeff, Castro Valley MAC; Rhodes, Richard, Planning Commission; Jacob, Mike, Planning Commission; Lopez, Albert, CDA; Bazar, Chris, CDA; Woldesenbet, Daniel; Lepere, Bill; Rocha, David, ACFD; Terra, Bonnie, ACFD; Miraglia, Cheryl, Castro Valley MAC; Robinson-Pinon, Angela, CDA

Subject: Housing Element- Governmental Constrains

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am writing to update you on the issue of the Alameda County Fire Dept. (ACFD) continuing to be an impediment to residential construction. I emailed you a report on June 8, 2014 (attached) listing six specific items where the ACFD actions have resulted in impeding the construction of residential dwelling units in the unincorporated areas of Alameda County. I documented proof on each item. Those items are as follows:

- 1. Applicants are given inaccurate information/told they cannot build on their properties.**
- 2. Extended time for approval.**
- 3. Fire Marshall refuses to meet with applicants**
- 4. Requiring over sized fire apparatus turnarounds**
- 5. Excessive road widths**
- 6. Overzealous Conditions of Approval.**

Only item 1 has been addressed by the transfer of Deputy Fire Marshall Bob Snodgrass from the Permit Center at 399 Elmhurst St. Snodgrass traded places with Deputy Fire Marshall Scott McMillan who was located in the city of Union City. Deputy Fire Marshall Scott McMillan has been a dramatic improvement in customer service. Fire Chief Rocha responded to me in a letter dated July 15, 2014 (attached). Chief Rocha's letter mainly talks about future improvements but does little or nothing to address the immediate needs facing residential construction (items 2-6).

Other than attaching my report to the Housing Element and the ACFD's limited response, there have been no actions taken by this Commission or County staff to even inquire about, much less resolve, the impediments listed.

In an email to Paul McDougall, Housing Policy Manager, HCD regarding his HCD Review Letter dated February 23, 2015 (attached), I asked about the revisions listed in the letter and if they pertain to the ACFD issues. Paul responded " [they added a program to address the constraints. We were also assured they had already taken some steps in the review process as well.](#)"

I followed up with an email to Chris Bazar on March 3 (attached) inquiring about this "PROGRAM" and his response was;

" The Ordinance Review Committee " that hasn't met in years.

"Environmental Streamlining" (I haven't seen any streamlining)

"Intergovernmental Coordination" (sounds good but once again just words)

All due respect to Chris, I am at a loss as to how someone as engaged and aware as myself is supposed to accept those answers as progress. This big circle that staff has laid out leads to nowhere.

I once again ask the Planning Commission for help in directing staff to:

A. List ACFD and the six items as impediments in the Governmental Constraints section of the 2015 Housing Element and separately list actions taken to remedy those constraints.

OR

B. Direct staff to start a public process to address these concerns with the ACFD so that they don't have to be listed in the Housing Element.

Thank you for your time,

Marc Crawford



P.O. Box 2151
Castro Valley, Ca. 94546
Office 510-881-7856
fax 510-881-7859
Cell 510-386-8880
crawco@comcast.net

Governmental Constraints- Alameda County Fire Department

Alameda County Housing Element 2014

The purpose of this document is to shed some light on the actions of the Alameda County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Branch in approving/disapproving residential development applications/inquiries. These actions result in multiple impediments to the construction of residential housing in the unincorporated areas of the County. I have encountered several troubling actions as a Councilmember of the Castro Valley Municipal Advisory Council as well as a private real estate developer. At this time I believe the severity of the problem has risen to the point that these actions need to be listed as impediments to construction of residential housing in the Governmental Constraints section of the 2014 Alameda County Housing Element. Furthermore the County needs to list what actions it will take to remedy these impediments.

In an effort to avoid this notification to you, a meeting was held on March 5, 2014 with Supervisor Miley, Interim Fire Chief Rocha, Fire Marshall Terra, CVMAC member Cheryl Miraglia, Bob Swanson and myself. Most of this document was presented to them at that time. There has been virtually no movement since that meeting. In fact, at that meeting, the Fire Marshall stated emphatically that she had solved one problem (applicants picking up approved plans, *see * below*) two months earlier. I tested this statement on April 2, 2014 when picking up approved fire plans. I asked the fire technician if I could have picked these up in her absence. She stated no, they had to be picked up from fire staff only. I confirmed this with a BID staffer that was present. Upon relaying this information to Chief Rocha, (*emails available*) that the Fire Marshall had been disingenuous in the prior meeting, he chose to cover for his senior staff by stating "Ms. BID Staffer and Ms. Fire Technician either did not understand or were misinformed of the process." These are the very people who take the money and release the plans. How could they be misinformed three months after the problem had been supposedly "solved?" This clearly demonstrates that a bunker mentality is in place as opposed to a problem solving approach. While the Supervisor's office has been proactive on this issue, it appears that greater pressure will be needed to address the myriad of problems.

This document represents the tip of the ice berg of the systemic problems at the Fire Prevention Branch. The Rental Housing Association, The Bay East Association of Realtors and the Building Industry Association of the Bay Area are all equally concerned about this issue and the negative effect on residential housing. All three trade groups are following this in great detail and will be meeting to determine next steps.

A small sample of the problems are listed below;

Applicants are given inaccurate information/told they cannot build on their properties.
Extended time for approval.
Fire Marshall refuses to meet with applicants
Requiring oversized fire apparatus turnarounds
Excessive road widths
Overzealous Conditions of Approval.

Applicants are given inaccurate information and told they cannot build on their properties

Examples

- PLN2013-179 On September 4, 2013 at 10:00am Doug Rogers and I met with Deputy Fire Marshall Bob Snodgrass regarding 17860 Almond Rd. Castro Valley (*See Exhibit 1*). This projects consists of three parcels, one fronting Almond Rd with a SFD and two vacant parcels to the rear

Governmental Constraints- Alameda County Fire Department

Alameda County Housing Element 2014

that were subdivided in 1949. At the meeting Deputy Fire Marshall Bob Snodgrass stated that there was a 30ft setback from all property lines. He even drew the lines in red pencil on the site plan that we brought. On one parcel this left a 6 foot wide building envelope. Essentially I was told that I could not build on these parcels. The only reason I was able to buy this project was the prior buyer (in escrow) was told by the Fire Dept. they could not build on it.

- BLD 2013-2120 Hydrant required for 640 sq ft Secondary Unit halts project until review comment is challenged (See Exhibit 2). Deputy Fire Marshall Snodgrass never looked at site plan on cover page to see no hydrant was required. \$120 review fee is for what exactly?
- BLD2010-01592 at 3751 La Costa Ave CV Deputy Fire Marshall Snodgrass signs off on not needing sprinklers or a hydrant(See Exhibit 3). After water meter is installed (\$20,000 cost), house plan check comes back needing sprinklers (\$6,000 to change meter and lateral) if nearest hydrant doesn't flow 1500gpm. The contradiction is bad enough, but the plan check is wrong since the requirement under 2010 CFC B105.1 is 1000gpm for single family dwellings under 3600 sq ft. The hydrant flowed 1550gpm, but the misinformation example stands.

Extended time for approvals

Examples

- Fire Prevention is understaffed.
- * Applicants are unable to pick up approved plans because there is no one at Fire Prevention at BID Permit Center for several days at a time. Fire Dept will not let BID staff take final payment on approved plans. I have waited as long as ten days to pick up plans.
- Often it can take several days to receive a return phone call from Deputy Fire Marshall Bob Snodgrass . I have waited up to a week in the past.
- I hand delivered a letter and an EBMUD Hydrant form (See Exhibit 4) on December 16, 2013. After waiting several weeks I called to inquire and was told it was never received. I hand delivered another on January 8 that was completed on January 13 (See Exhibit 5). It still took 5 additional days to receive a form that takes 30 seconds to be completed. This after losing the first one. No consideration is given to expedite the second.
- PLN2013-179 Submitted 10/09/13. I sent an email to inquire about timing. Comments received November 14. Waited 5 weeks for first set of comments.

Fire Marshall refuses to meet with applicants

Examples

- PLN2013-179 November 14 Comment #1 results in loss of building status on lot 1. Requested meeting on November 21 (See Exhibit 6)
- No response, emailed two alternative turnaround layouts on Nov 26.
- No response until December 3.
- December 4 meeting held at 399 Elmhurst at 8am. Fire Marshall states she will review alternative turnaround layouts with Fire Chief the next day. Another week goes by with no word.
- No word until Dec 12 (See Exhibit 9) after inquiry from Supervisor's office.

Governmental Constraints- Alameda County Fire Department

Alameda County Housing Element 2014

Requiring oversized fire apparatus turnarounds

Ordinance O-2103-46 amended Chapter 6.04 of Title 6 of the Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda. Specifically, 6.04.120 Appendix D- Fire Apparatus Access Roads, Section D103- Minimum Specifications. (See Exhibit 8).

Figure D103.1 (Dead-End Fire Apparatus Access Road Turnaround) is amended to show: A 70' "Y" and a 140' Hammerhead and Acceptable Alternative to 140' Hammerhead.

This is in excess of what the State requires under 2013 California Fire Code at the top of page 544 (See Exhibit 12). which is a 60' "Y" and a 120' Hammerhead and Acceptable Alternative to 120' Hammerhead. This dramatically reduces the development yield on the long narrow parcels that make up the majority of the infill housing sites in the unincorporated areas. This was passed with no stakeholder input.

There has been no environmental review completed on the increased impervious surface area required under this ordinance change. There needs to be a CEQA review in conjunction with ordinance revision or the revision should be reversed.

Examples

- PLN2013-179 Oversized turnaround requirement has too much impact on two lot projects. (See Exhibit 1).
- Parcel Map 10193 Edwards Lane Castro Valley a five lot subdivision was reduced to a four lots as a result of oversized turnaround requirements (See Exhibit 10).

Excessive road widths

Examples

- Parcel Map 10193 Edwards Lane Castro Valley was reduced to a four lots as a result of excessive road width requirements 24ft vs. 20ft (See Exhibit 10).

Overzealous Conditions of Approval.

- PLN2013-179 Draft Conditions of Approval #12 The minimum section for emergency vehicle access is 6 inches of asphalt concrete. Public Works states this is a requirement of the Fire Department. This is a thicker section than is required on County roads.
- PLN2013-179 Planning Dept. Final Conditions of Approval #16 all access roads, hydrants and site utilities must be installed prior to combustible construction(See Exhibit 7). This requirement halts the project since some utility work is completed at the same time as buildings are constructed. The hydrant requirement delays projects up to 6 months because it is out of the developer's control as EBMUD determines the installation schedule for hydrants. Planning Dept. states this is a requirement of the Fire Department.
- PLN2013-179 Fire Conditions of Approval dramatically increase in severity after supervisor staff inquiry. (Exhibit 6 vs Exhibit 9). Conditions in Exhibit 9 adds \$40,000 to the project costs. I would call this retaliation.

Governmental Constraints- Alameda County Fire Department Alameda County Housing Element 2014

- PLN2013-179 Fire Conditions of Approval #3 Fire resistive fencing. [The Fire Marshall has no legal authority to require fire resistive fencing on fences 6 feet and under in either 2010 CBC or 2010 CFC. An appeal to Fire Chief Rocha reverses this abusive condition.](#)
- Parcel Map 10193 Edwards Lane Castro Valley Public Works Memorandum #20 The minimum section for emergency vehicle access is 6 inches of asphalt concrete. [Public Works states this is a requirement of the Fire Department. This is a thicker section than is required on County roads.](#) PLN2013-153 for a remodel of an existing house, Public Works Memorandum #5 The minimum section for emergency vehicle access is 6 inches of asphalt concrete. [Public Works states this is a requirement of the Fire Department. This is a thicker section than is required on County roads.](#)
- BLD 2013-3000 & BLD2013-3001 Fire Department House Plan Review Comments #3 [\(See Exhibit 11\) Deputy Fire Marshall repeated reference to a 30 foot setback. This applies to an SRA, State Responsibility Area. This does not apply to an LRA, Local Responsibility Area](#)

In closing, I would like nothing better than to see these problems resolved in an expeditious and professional manner. The situation has been allowed to fester under the current management due to the lack of development projects. It is only coming to light now as the construction industry starts to recover. I think a task force made up of Planning Commissioners, CVMAC Members, Planning, Public Works and Fire staff should be assembled immediately to form a plan to reverse all identified impediments in all three departments.

Sincerely,

Marc Crawford



**3832 Somerset Ave.
Castro Valley, Ca. 94546
Office 510-881-7856
fax 510-881-7859
Cell 510-386-8880
crawco@comcast.net**



Exhibit 2

Alameda County Fire Department Fire Prevention Bureau Review Comments

399 Elmhurst Street Rm. 120, Hayward, California 94544 (510) 670-5853 Fax (510) 887-5836

Address	Temp Fern Way (198300	BLD#	13-2120	FD #	
Business	Perry Residence			Occ. Class	R-3
Job Description	SFD Addition Attached Secondary Unit w Breezeway				
Contact Person	Mark Crawford	Contact #	(510) 881-7856	Fax	
Fire Department Contact	Robert Snodgrass (510) 670-5853	Date	9/24/13	Review #	1

WITH CUSTOMER FOR RESPONSE

Re-submittal Required. A re-submittal is required for this project. Submit your response to the building department. Include an itemized response to each comment and where in the submittals the specific change or information can be found. Cloud all changes and provide a revision date.

CORRECTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS REQUIRED.

Include an itemized response to each comment and where in the submittals the specific change or information can be found. Cloud all changes and provide a revision date.

1. Show on the plans the location of the closest hydrant. This hydrant needs to be within 250 feet of the driveway.

Response: _____

2. Provide Water Flow Data from EBMUD indicating that the closest hydrant flows a minimum of 1750 gallons per minute at 20 psi. A Fire Protection System through out the residence (primary and secondary) can reduce this requirement to 1,000 gallons per minute.

Response: _____



HYDRANT / FIRE SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

If you have questions about completing this form, please call (510) 287-1008

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT			FOR DISTRICT USE	
PRINT NAME Crawford Incorporated	E-MAIL ADDRESS crawco@comcast.net		Est. No.	_____
MAILING ADDRESS 3832 Somerset Ave	CITY Castro Valley	ZIP CODE 94546	By	_____
ATTENTION Marc Crawford	PHONE NO. 510 386-8880		Date	_____
PROJECT ADDRESS / TRACT TITLE / LOT NO(S) 3751+3759 La Costa Ave. (PM 9609) ^{Lots 1+2}		CITY Castro Valley	Map No.	_____
<p>Before a water service estimate will be processed, the applicant must furnish fire hydrant information and fire flow requirements as specified by the fire protection agency.</p> <p>Applicant Signature <u>[Signature]</u> Date <u>7-13-10</u></p>				

TO BE COMPLETED BY FIRE PROTECTION AGENCY

FIRE HYDRANTS

NOT REQUIRED – Skip to Private Fire Services.

REQUIRED: Public (Number of hydrants _____) or Private (Number of hydrants _____)

Specified to be a total of _____ gallons per minute supplied by _____ hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously for a duration of _____ minutes. Each individual hydrant shall provide a minimum flow of _____ gallons per minute.

(Unless otherwise indicated, fire flow is assumed at a minimum design residual pressure of 20 psi in the water main under normal operating design flow conditions. Fire flow is a design factor and is not guaranteed.)

Remarks _____

PRIVATE FIRE SERVICES

NOT REQUIRED – Skip to bottom of page and sign.

REQUIRED: Number of private fire services _____

NOTE: A combination standard/fire service is limited to a single family premise or a multi-family premise of two units. Applicant must complete and submit a Dual Service Application signed by the local fire protection agency.


Remarks _____

Fire Protection Agency Alameda County Fire Department Phone No. (510) 610 5577

Signature for Protection Agency [Signature] Date 7/16/10

Print Name Robert Snodgrass Title Deputy Fire Marshal

E-Mail Address _____



Alameda County Fire Department

Fire Prevention Bureau

Review Comments

399 Elmhurst Street Rm. 120, Hayward, California 94544 (510) 670-5853 Fax (510) 887-5836

Address	3759 La Costa Ave. Castro Valley	BLD#	10-01593	FD #	
Business	Crawford Inc.			Occ. Class	R-3
Job Description	New SFD				
Contact Person	Crawford Inc.	Contact #	(510) 881-7856	Fax#	881-7859
Reviewed By	R. Snodgrass	Date	8/10/10	Review #	1

WITH CUSTOMER FOR RESPONSE

Re-submittal Required. A re-submittal is required for this project. Submit your response to the building department. Include an itemized response to each comment and where in the submittals the specific change or information can be found. Cloud all changes and provide a revision date.

CORRECTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS REQUIRED.

Include an itemized response to each comment and where in the submittals the specific change or information can be found. Cloud all changes and provide a revision date.

1. This structure falls in the fire flow requirements of 3601- 4800 for a type VB column. This Hydrant will need to flow 1500 gallons per minute from the closest hydrant, otherwise a sprinkler system will need to be installed.

Response: _____

2. On Page A-1, Plans indicate that the construction type is VN. This classification no longer exist in the Building or Fire code and should be changed to VB.

Response: _____

3. A smoke detector appears in the garage and in the stairway way leading to the garage. Neither location requires a smoke detector and should be removed.

Response: _____



3832 Somerset Ave. Castro Valley, Ca. 94546 510-881-7856

December 16, 2013

Robert Snodgrass
Alameda County Fire Department
399 Elmhurst Street.
Hayward, Ca. 94544

Re: Hydrant Application for PLN2013-00179

Dear Bob,

The last time that I met with Fire Marshall Terra I asked if I could submit this form to you for approval. There doesn't seem to be any issue with the hydrant requirement or location. The idea would be to get EBMUD's engineering process moving forward. She stated that it would be OK and she would have signed it if I had one on me. Next time I will bring one.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Marc Crawford".

Marc Crawford, President
Crawford Inc.



HYDRANT / FIRE SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

If you have questions about completing this form, please call (510) 287-1008

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT		FOR DISTRICT USE
PRINT NAME Crawford Incorporated	E-MAIL ADDRESS crawco@comcast.net	Est. No. _____
MAILING ADDRESS 3832 Somerset Ave.	CITY Castro Valley	By _____
	ZIP CODE 94546	Date _____
ATTENTION Marc Crawford	PHONE NO. 510-386-8880	Map No. _____
PROJECT ADDRESS / TRACT TITLE / LOT NO(S) 17860 Almond Rd. / PLN2013-00179	CITY Castro Valley	

Before a water service estimate will be processed, the applicant must furnish fire hydrant information and fire flow requirements as specified by the fire protection agency.

Applicant Signature Date 11/21/2013

TO BE COMPLETED BY FIRE PROTECTION AGENCY

FIRE HYDRANTS (PUBLIC OR PRIVATE)

- NOT REQUIRED – (Skip to Private Fire Services.)
- REQUIRED: Public Number of hydrants _____ or Private Number of hydrants _____

A total of _____ gallons per minute supplied by _____ hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously for a duration of _____ minutes. Each individual hydrant shall provide a minimum flow of _____ gallons per minute.

Unless otherwise indicated, fire flow is calculated down to at a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi in the water main under normal operating design flow conditions. Fire flow is a design factor and is not guaranteed.

Remarks _____

PRIVATE FIRE SERVICES

New Residential: Single family premises, multi-family premises with two units and Townhomes

- NOT REQUIRED – Skip to bottom of page and sign.
- REQUIRED – Number of private fire services _____ – Skip to bottom of page and sign
- All Water Service Applications for new single family premises, townhomes and multi-family premises of two units that require a combination standard/fire service must include a completed Application for Dual Service signed by the local fire protection agency.

Commercial, Residential Remodels, New Residential Multi-Family premises with greater than two units.

- NOT REQUIRED – Skip to bottom of page and sign.
- REQUIRED: Number of private fire services _____

Remarks _____

Fire Protection Agency _____	Phone No. _____
Signature for Protection Agency _____	Date _____
Print Name _____	Title _____
E-Mail Address _____	



January 14, 2014

Robert Snodgrass
Alameda County Fire Department
399 Elmhurst Street.
Hayward, Ca. 94544

Re: Hydrant Application for PLN2013-00179

Bob,

Evidently, EBMUD wants the Fire Dept. to sign off on the location of the new hydrant. I assume that the location shown on the approved private street application is acceptable. I need to submit this site plan copy to EBMUD with your sign-off. Please let me know right away if there are any problems.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Marc Crawford".

Marc Crawford, President
Crawford Inc.



HYDRANT / FIRE SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

If you have questions about completing this form, please call (510) 287-1008

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT			FOR DISTRICT USE	
PRINT NAME Crawford Incorporated		E-MAIL ADDRESS crawco@comcast.net		Est. No. _____
MAILING ADDRESS 3832 Somerset Ave.		CITY Castro Valley	ZIP CODE 94546	By _____
ATTENTION Marc Crawford		PHONE NO. 5103868880		Date _____
PROJECT ADDRESS / TRACT TITLE / LOT NO(S). 17860 Almond Rd. PLN2013-179		CITY Castro Valley		Map No. _____

Before a water service estimate will be processed, the applicant must furnish fire hydrant information and fire flow requirements as specified by the fire protection agency.

Applicant Signature *Marc Crawford, President* Date 01/08/2013

TO BE COMPLETED BY FIRE PROTECTION AGENCY

FIRE HYDRANTS (PUBLIC OR PRIVATE)

- NOT REQUIRED – (Skip to Private Fire Services.)
- REQUIRED: Public Number of hydrants 1 or Private Number of hydrants _____

A total of 1,000 gallons per minute supplied by 1 hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously for a duration of 120 minutes. Each individual hydrant shall provide a minimum flow of 1,000 gallons per minute.

Unless otherwise indicated, fire flow is calculated down to at a minimum residual pressure of 20 psi in the water main under normal operating design flow conditions. Fire flow is a design factor and is not guaranteed.

Remarks _____

PRIVATE FIRE SERVICES

New Residential: Single family premises, multi-family premises with two units and Townhomes

- NOT REQUIRED – Skip to bottom of page and sign.
- REQUIRED – Number of private fire services _____ – Skip to bottom of page and sign


All Water Service Applications for new single family premises, townhomes and multi-family premises of two units that require a combination standard/fire service must include a completed Application for Dual Service signed by the local fire protection agency.

Commercial, Residential Remodels, New Residential Multi-Family premises with greater than two units.

- NOT REQUIRED – Skip to bottom of page and sign.
- REQUIRED: Number of private fire services _____

Remarks _____

Fire Protection Agency <u>Alameda County Fire Department</u>	Phone No. <u>(510) 670-5877</u>
Signature for Protection Agency <u><i>Robert Snodgrass</i></u>	Date <u>1/13/14</u>
Print Name <u>ROBERT SNODGRASS</u>	Title <u>Deputy Fire Marshal</u>
E-Mail Address _____	



Alameda County Fire Department
FIRE PREVENTION

www.acgov.org/fire

Exhibit 6

November 14, 2013

DEMETRIOS N. SHAFFER
Fire Chief

COUNTY
FIRE PREVENTION
399 Elmhurst, Room 120
Hayward, CA 94544
tel (510) 670-5853
fax (510) 887-5836

DUBLIN
FIRE PREVENTION
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA 94568
Tel (925) 833-6606
Fax (925) 829-9248

EMERYVILLE
FIRE PREVENTION
1333 Park Avenue
Emeryville, CA 94608
Tel (510) 596-3759
Fax (510) 450-7812

NEWARK
FIRE PREVENTION
37101 Newark Blvd.
Newark, CA 94560
Tel (510) 578-4218
Fax (510) 578-4281

SAN LEANDRO
FIRE PREVENTION
839 E. 14th Street
San Leandro, CA 94577
Tel (510) 577-3312
Fax (510) 577-3419

UNION CITY
FIRE PREVENTION
34009 Alvarado-Niles Road
Union City, CA 94587
Tel (510) 675-5470
Fax (510) 441-2943

Crawford Properties
17860 Almond Road
Castro Valley, CA 94546

RE: Private Street Approval

Dear Mr. Crawford,


Thanks for submitting and plan for your proposed private street. I reviewed your proposed street plan with Deputy Chief Rocha. In order for the fire department to approve the plan a couple of minor changes and/or notes will need to be added. Those changes are as follows:

1. The hammerhead turn around will need to be revised slightly to accommodate fire apparatus requirements. As currently show the there is a bend in the long side.
2. Several areas are noted to be compacted base rock. In order for this to meet fire department requirements. You will need to note on the plans that the surface will be all weather and support 75,000 lbs. gross vehicle weight. Then at time of final or prior, a letter from a licensed engineer will need to be provided to the fire department certifying that the road is all weather and will support the 75,000 lbs.
3. The roadway will need to be shown and deeded as a reciprocal fire department access easement for all parcels.

I hope this information is helpful.

Sincerely,

Bonnie S. Terra
Division Chief/Fire Marshal



ALAMEDA COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Chris Bazar
Agency Director

January 8, 2014

Albert Lopez
Planning Director

Marc Crawford
3832 Somerset Avenue
Castro Valley, CA 94546

224
West Winton Ave
Room 111

Dear Applicant:

Hayward
California
94544

Private Street Application, PLN2013-00179

phone
510.670.5400
fax
510.785.8793

Your Private Street application, PLN2013-00179, to allow a private road serving three existing parcels in an “R-1-SU-RV” (Single Family Residential, Secondary Unit and Recreational Parking is permitted) District located at 17860 Almond Road, east side, south of School Way, bearing Assessor’s Parcel Numbers: 084D-1180-018-02; 084D-1180-018-03; and 084D-018-020, has been approved subject to “Exhibit B, PLN2013-00179” and the attached Conditions of Approval.

www.acgov.org/cda

This action may be appealed within 10 days after the date of this letter by submitting a letter to the Planning Department, 224 West Winton Avenue, Room 111, Hayward, CA 94544. The project applicant will be charged actual County costs for consideration of appeals. An appeal fee of \$250.00 must be submitted by anyone else appealing an action. The Private Street Application number, the condition appealed, and the reason for the appeal should be clearly stated in the letter.

If you have any questions, please contact Christine Greene at (510) 670-5400.

Very truly yours,

Albert Lopez
Planning Director

Cc: Building Inspection Department, Alameda County Public Works Agency
Grading Department, Alameda County Public Works Agency
Land Development Services, Public Works Agency
Alameda County Fire Department



PRIVATE STREET APPROVAL, PLN2013-00179

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

January 8, 2014

The Parcels Served:

1. This approval, providing frontage and Building Site status to an area of land approximately 34,821 square feet in area, applies to the subject area only. The subject area is comprised of APN's **084D-1180-018-02; 084D-1180-018-03; and 084D-1180-020.**

Prior to Issuance of a Grading Permit

2. Review and approval of the access road plans by Alameda County Fire Department is required prior to the issuance of a Grading Permit.

Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit

3. County design requirements control access point to a county road. Design of the proposed private road shall conform to the county's concerns with regards to tie-in, angle of approach, steepness and sight distance for any roadway connection to the County road. Design the roadway entrances to intersect the road right of way at a perpendicular angle. Also, design consideration as to the width and structural section of the private road should take into account the future use of the subject private street.
4. Acquire an encroachment permit from Alameda County for all work within the County road right-of-way.
5. No grading shall be permitted on this site until a grading plan and an erosion and sedimentation control plans have been reviewed by the County and a grading permit is issued in accordance with the Alameda County Grading Ordinance, including any related CEQA review.
6. No grading work is allowed during the rainy season except upon a clear demonstration, to the satisfaction of the Director of the Public Works, that at no stage of the work will there be any substantial risk of increased sediment discharge from the site.
7. Detailed road improvement plans, prepared by an Engineer, shall be submitted to the Planning, Public Works, and Alameda County Fire Department for approval.
8. Applicant shall submit to the Planning Department for approval a joint maintenance agreement to guarantee perpetual maintenance of the access road.

Exhibit 7

During Construction of the Access Road and Prior to Final Inspection:

9. All required plans, specifications, and technical data necessary to complete the construction of the private street shall be filed with the Director of Public Works. Requirements for the construction of the private street, review fees, improvements and inspections of work shall be determined by the Director of Public Works. Approval of the private street shall also be based on requirements conveyed to the applicant by Public Works, Land Development Division, in memorandum dated December 5, 2013.
10. Applicant shall construct the access road in accordance with the approved plans.
11. The roadway must be able to support 75,000 lbs. gross vehicle weight in all weather conditions. The applicant is to provide verification to the Fire Department in the form of a letter from a licensed engineer.
12. Any development on the parcels will be required to comply with all requirements set forth in Chapter 7A of the Building Code in effect at the time of permit submittal.
13. Any development plans shall include an additional hydrant along the Almond Road frontage, structures shall be equipped with fire sprinklers, fire resistive fencing is required, fire resistive plants is required and a vegetation management plan is required.
14. Prior to commencing construction of new dwellings, access road shall be installed and completed meeting all the requirements of the Alameda County Fire Department.
15. Prior to release of guarantees and approval or acceptance of the improvement work by the County, a letter from the County of Alameda Fire Department is required indicating they have inspected the work within their scope and found it to conform to their requirements.

Fire Safety Prior to and During Construction:

16. Applicant shall follow all requirements as called out by Alameda County Fire Department. The following are some key requirements that need to be considered early on in the development.

Access Roads. Access roads shall be installed prior to combustible construction commencing.

Fire Hydrants. Fire hydrants shall be installed and in-service prior to combustible construction commencing.

Exhibit 7

Street Signs/Addressing. Addressing and/or street signs shall be provided at the main entrance and along the access road as necessary to clearly identify the buildings and indicate the access route to the building.

Vegetation Management. During periods where the vegetation is dry, fire clearance and vegetation management requirements shall be complied with and maintained.

Site Utilities. Site utilities that would require the access road to be dug up and/or made impassible shall be installed prior to combustible construction commencing.

17. Applicant shall record the approved joint maintenance agreement for perpetual maintenance of the access road against the titles of all affected properties.

Exhibit 7

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 5, 2013

TO: Albert Lopez, Planning Director

ATTENTION: Christine Greene, Development Planning Division

COPY: John Rogers, Grading and Permits Section
Allen Lang, Building Inspection Department

FROM: Kyin Yee Yin, Development Services *KY*

SUBJECT: PLN2013-00179 – Private Street Approval
17860 Almond Rd, Castro Valley

Reference is made to your correspondence your exhibit and transmittal letter dated October 28, 2013, regarding the application to allow a private street, located at 17860 Almond Rd, unincorporated area of Castro Valley, bearing County Assessor's designation: APN **084D-1180-018-02, 084D-1180-018-03 and 084D-1180-020-00**. This memo supersedes the memo on file dated Nov 21, 2013.

Due to the limited information provided, we completed only the preliminary review. When grading, drainage, and road improvement plans are submitted, the detailed review can begin.

Should this application receive favorable consideration by the Planning Department, please consider the following recommendations in establishing the conditions of approval:

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

1. It is understood by this office that the proposed lot #2 and #3 home sites may be subject to individual Site Development Reviews by the Planning Department when the sites are developed. We would be looking at the 10,000 sq. ft. trigger for C.3.c compliance; or C.3.i Site Design Measures for Small Projects compliance if the new and replaced impervious surfaces are below 10,000 sq. ft. for the complete development of each individual lot.
2. The proposed driveway at the northwesterly corner of the property is shown to be right at the property line, and there is an existing utility pole there. At least 3' clearance from the face of existing pole will be required. Therefore, it is recommended to either shift the driveway or relocate the pole.
3. Show all easements, existing and proposed. An easement is required for access and utilities, the maintenance of which will be tied to the project's Joint Maintenance Agreement.

GENERAL COMMENTS

4. Any road improvements and any necessary relocation of utilities shall be at no cost to the County.
5. A Joint Maintenance Agreement is needed for the common driveway, drainage, retaining walls, storm water treatment devices and parking area.
6. Provide a County Fire Department approved turnaround for each driveway and/or private Street.
7. In anticipation of the build-out of the two vacant lots in the rear, all roadway and storm drain facilities must be designed and constructed to conform to Alameda County's Hydrology and Hydraulics Criteria Summary. All work must be in compliance with Alameda County ordinances, guidelines, and permit requirements.
8. If a drainage pump system is to be used, the system must consist of two pumps for each sump, one main pump and one alternate pump, each individually capable of pumping the design flow rate. Pump specifications and maintenance manual must be provided for review and approval. The responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the pump system shall be specifically defined in the project's Joint Maintenance Agreement.
9. Acquire an encroachment permit from Alameda County for all work within the roadway right-of-way.
10. On-site driveway and parking area structural pavement section are required to be designed by a civil engineer. The minimum structural section should be 2 inches asphalt concrete over 6 inches aggregate base, or equivalent. The minimum structural section for emergency vehicle access roads shall conform to the County Fire Department requirements.
11. Existing landscaping along the public street frontage should not create sight obstructions at the driveway. Provide adequate sight distance for vehicles exiting and entering the site. Trimming or removal of landscaping may be required.
12. All paved slopes should have a minimum 0.5 percent grade.

If you have any questions, please call me at X55954.

/KYY

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 6.04 OF TITLE 6 OF THE ORDINANCE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA RELATING TO THE PREVENTION OF FIRES, AND ADOPTING BY REFERENCE THE 2012 EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL FIRE CODE AS AMENDED BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AND 2013 EDITION OF THE CALIFORNIA FIRE CODE.

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda and the Board of Directors of the Alameda County Fire Department ordain as follows:

SECTION I

Chapter 6.04 of Title 6 of the Alameda County Ordinance Code is amended to read:

6.04.000. Fees.

The County Ordinance 0-93-17, setting forth the Alameda County Fire Protection District fees shall remain in full force and effect.

6.04.010. California Fire Code.

There is hereby adopted that certain Code known as the "2013 California Fire Code", including all sections of Chapter 1 including Division II, Section 503 and appendices B, C, and D compiled by the International Code Council being particularly the California Fire Code 2013 edition thereof and whole thereof, save and except such portions as are hereinafter deleted, modified, or amended. One copy of said Code is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

The following sections shall constitute the deletions, modifications, amendments and additions to the 2013 California Fire Code.

6.04.020 Chapter 1-Scope and Administration, Section 101 Division II Administration

Section 101.1 Title is amended to read:

This Code shall be known as the "Alameda County Fire Code," may be cited as such, and will be herein referred to as "this Code."

6.4.30 Chapter 1-Scope and Administration

Section 1.11.2.1.1 Enforcement is amended to read:

The responsibility for enforcement of building standards adopted by the State Fire Marshal and published in the California Building Standards Code relating to fire and panic safety and other regulations of the State Fire Marshal shall, except as provided in Section 1.11.2.1.2, be as follows:

1. The city, county, or city and county with jurisdiction in the area affected by the standard or regulation shall delegate the enforcement of the building standards

relating to fire and panic safety and other regulations of the State Fire Marshal, as they relate to Group R-3 as described in Section 3410.1 of Part 2 of the California Building Standards Code, to the following:

- 1.1. The chief of the fire department serving the county, or chiefs authorized representative.

6.04.040 Chapter 1-Scope and Administration, Section 1.11 - Office of the State Fire Marshal.

Section 1.11.4.7 Other Fees is added to read: Pursuant to Health and Safety Code Sections 13146.2, 1597.46, 13217, 13235, and 13131.5 the county may charge and collect fees in an amount as set forth in the separately adopted Alameda County Ordinance (Fees for Service) of which the most current will apply. It should be noted that a fee shall be charged to cover the cost of any fire prevention service for enforcing any regulations.

6.04.050 Chapter 1-Division II Administration, Section 101-General

Section 101.1 Title is amended to read:

This Code shall be known as the "Alameda County Fire Code," maybe cited as such, and will be herein referred to as "this Code."

6.4.60 Chapter I-Division II Administration, Section 108-Board of Appeals

Section 108.1 (Board of Appeals) established is amended to read:

1. Board of Appeals- In order to hear and decide appeals or orders, decisions or determinations made by the Fire Code Official relative to the application and interpretation of this code, there shall be and is hereby created a Board of Appeals to provide interpretations of the Code other than those approved by the Fire Chief.

Upon receipt of an appeal in writing, the Fire Chief shall request the appointment by the Board of Supervisors of a Board of Appeals consisting of five (5) members qualified by experience and training to pass upon matters pertaining to the subject matter of the appeal and to serve until disposition of the appeal. The Fire Chief or his/her designee shall be an ex officio member of the Board of Appeals and act as the secretary. The Board of Appeals shall adopt reasonable rules for conducting its hearings and investigations.

The Board of Appeals shall, after considering all facts presented, render a decision as to the applicability and interpretation of this Code and as to an alternate means of protection; and determine if the proposal is equivalent to those specified in these regulations in quality, strength, effectiveness, fire resistance, durability and safety. The Board of Appeals shall submit to the applicant and Fire Chief its decision as well as findings and recommendations.

Any recommendations, actions or decisions by the Board of Appeals shall not be construed as to permit a violation of any other codes or laws. The decision of the Board

of Appeals shall be final. The applicant or Fire Chief may promptly request a review thereof by the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors may limit its review to pertinent parts of the record, findings and decision of the Board of Appeals or at its sole discretion take additional evidence or arguments on the issue.

Exhibit 8

2. Appeals- Whenever the Fire Chief shall disapprove an alternate means of protection, refuse to grant a permit or application, or when it is claimed that the provisions of this Code do not apply, or that the true intent and meaning of the Code have been misconstrued or wrongly interpreted, the applicant may appeal from the decision of the Fire Chief to the Board of Appeals. Such appeal shall be made within 15 days from the date of the Fire Chief's decision.

Whenever any subject regulated in this Code is also regulated by Title 15, Alameda County Ordinance Code the provisions of this Code which are applicable to new construction, alteration or repair shall be enforced by the Fire Chief and by the Alameda County Building Official if a building permit is required for such new construction, alteration or repair by Title 15, Alameda County Ordinance Code.

If there is a conflict between the enforcement of this Code by the Fire Chief and Title 15 by the Building Official, the more restrictive requirements shall apply.

6.4.70 Chapter Administration, Section 109 - Violations

Section 109.3 (Notice of Violation) is amended by adding the following sentence:

In cases of extreme danger to persons or property, immediate compliance shall be required, and/or the Fire Chief may remove, or cause to be removed, the hazard at the expense of the owner or responsible party.

Section 109.4 (Violation penalties) is amended to read:

1. Any person, firm, corporation, association, or government entity which is regulated by this Code and has violated, or caused to be violated, or permitted to be violated any provisions of this Code, shall be deemed guilty of an infraction, unless such violation is specified to be a misdemeanor.
2. Any person, firm, corporation, association, or government entity convicted of a misdemeanor under the provisions of this Code shall be subject to a fine, or imprisonment, or both, not to exceed the limits set forth in California Penal Code Section 19.
3. Any person, firm, corporation, association, or government entity convicted of an infraction under the provisions of this Code shall be punishable upon first conviction by a fine of not less than fifty dollars.
4. In addition to the foregoing penalties, any condition caused or permitted to exist in violation of any of the provisions of this Code, shall be deemed a public nuisance and may be abated as such.

5. Each person, firm, corporation, association, or government entity shall be guilty of a separate offense for each and every day during any portion of which any violation of any provision of this Code is committed, continued or permitted by any of them, and shall be punishable accordingly.
6. The Fire Chief and his authorized representatives may make arrests or issue citations for any violations of this Code, or any other ordinance of the County of Alameda and laws of the State of California pertaining to fire prevention, protection and life safety.
7. Any person, firm, corporation, association, or government entity operating or maintaining any occupancy, premises, or vehicle subject to this Code shall not permit or allow a fire hazard to exist or fail to take immediate action to correct same on premises under his control or ownership. Failure to comply with an order or notice when ordered or notified to do so by the Fire Chief or his authorized representatives shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

Section 109.4.2 (Administrative Abatement) is added to this Code to read:

The provisions of this Code may be enforced pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 15.28 of Title 15 of the Alameda County Ordinance Code.

6.4.80 Chapter 9- Fire Protection Systems, Section 903- Automatic Fire Sprinkler Systems

Section 903.2.1.1 (Group A-1) is amended to read:

An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided for Group A-1 occupancies where one of the following conditions exists:

1. The fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet.
2. The fire area has an occupant load of 300 or more.
3. The fire area is located on a floor other than a level of exit discharge serving such occupancies.
4. The fire area contains a multi-theater complex.

Section 903.2.1.3 (Group A-3) is amended to read:

An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided for Group A-3 occupancies where one of the following conditions exists:

1. The fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet.
2. The fire area has an occupant load of 300 or more.

3. The fire area is located on a floor other than a level of exit discharge serving such occupancies.

Exhibit 8

Section 903.2.1.4 (Group A-4) is amended to read:

An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided for Group A-4 occupancies where one of the following exists:

1. The fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet.
2. The fire area has an occupant load of 300 or more.
3. The fire area is located on a floor other than a level of exit discharge serving such occupancies.

Section 903.2.2.2 (Group B) is added to read:

An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided in Group B occupancies where the fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet.

Section 903.2.3 (Group E) is amended to read:

An automatic sprinkler system shall be installed in Group E occupancies where the fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet.

Section 903.2.4 (Group F-1) is amended to read:

An automatic sprinkler system shall be installed in Group F-1 occupancies where one of the following conditions exists:

1. The Group F-1 fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet.
2. The Group F-1 fire area is located more than three stories above grade plane.
3. A Group F-1 occupancy used for the manufacture of upholstered furniture or mattresses exceeds 2,500 square feet.

Section 903.27 (Group M) is amended to read:

An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout buildings containing Group M occupancies where one of the following conditions exists:

1. A Group M fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet.
2. A Group M fire area is located more than three stories above the grade plan.

Section 903.2.9 (Group S-1) is amended to read:

An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout all buildings containing a Group S-1 occupancies where one of the following conditions exists:

- I. A Group S-1 fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet.
2. A Group S-1 fire area is located more than three stories above grade plane.

3. A Group S-1 occupancy used for the manufacture of upholstered furniture or mattresses exceeds 2,500 square feet.

Section 903.2.10 (Group S-2 enclosed parking garages) is amended to read:

Exhibit 8

An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided throughout all buildings classified as enclosed parking garages with Section 406.4 of the California Building Code as follows:

1. Where the fire area of the enclosed parking garage exceeds 5,000 square feet or
2. Where the enclosed parking garage is located beneath other groups.

Section 903.2.18.1 (Group U) is added to read:

An automatic sprinkler system shall be provided for Group U Occupancies where the fire area exceeds 5,000 square feet (465m²).

Section 903.2.19 (Existing Buildings) is added to read:

When an addition to an existing building causes the total square footage of the building to exceed 5,000 square feet (465m²) the entire building shall be equipped with sprinklers.

Section 903.2.20 (Existing Buildings) is added to read:

When a change in occupancy or use to more hazardous occurs, the structure will be required to meet the requirements as set forth for new construction for the new occupancy classification.

6.04.090 Chapter 9-Fire Protection Systems, Section 907-Fire Alarm and Detection Systems

Section 907.10 (False Alarms) is added to this Code to read:

A false alarm is defined in Section 202.

Section 907.10.1 (Excessive False Alarms) is added to this Code to read:

Malfunctions, or mechanical trip of any sprinkler alarm or other fire protection or detection system resulting in an alarm and emergency dispatch of the Fire Department shall be subject to a false alarm charge as established by this Code.

Exception: During a thirty (30) day period following the installation of any new fire alarm system, the Fire Chief shall determine if the false alarms emanating from said new installation are excessive.

Section 907.10.2 (Charges) is added to read:

After the initial thirty (30) day period following the installation of a new system, two (2) false alarms within a consecutive ninety (90) day period shall be deemed excessive and will be charged as false alarms.

Section 907.10.3 (False Alarm Charges) is added to read:

1st false alarm

Warning Letter

2nd false alarm in any 90 day period \$100.00

3rd and subsequent false alarms in any 90 day period \$200.00

Exhibit 8

6.04.100 Chapter 28- Lumber Yards and Wood Working Facilities, Section 2808- Storage and Processing of Wood Chips, Hogged Material Fines, Compost and Raw Product Associated with Yard Waste and Recycling Facilities

Section 2808.3 (Size of Piles) is amended to read:

Piles shall not exceed 12 feet in height, 50 feet in width and 250 feet in length.

6.04.110 Chapter 56- Explosives and Fireworks, Section 5601- General

Section 5601.1(Fireworks) is amended to read:

The possession, manufacture, storage, sale, handling and use of fireworks are prohibited is amended to read: Storage, use and handling of fireworks are prohibited. It is unlawful for any person to sell or offer for sale any fireworks, dangerous fireworks or safe and sane fireworks or, fire, discharge or explode or cause to be fired, discharged or exploded any fireworks except at public displays as hereinafter provided in this Chapter. Exception I, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are retained as stated.

6.04.120 Appendix D- Fire Apparatus Access Roads, Section D103- Minimum Specifications

Figure D103.1 (Dead-End Fire Apparatus Access Road Turnaround) is amended to show:

A 70' "Y" and a 140' Hammerhead and Acceptable Alternative to 140' Hammerhead.

SECTION II

Exhibit 8

This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from and after the date of passage, and before the expiration of fifteen (15) days after its passage, shall be published in the Inter-City Express, a newspaper published in the said County of Alameda.

Adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda, State of California, on November 5, 2013, by the following called vote:

AYES: Supervisors: Chan, Haggerty & Miley - 3

NOES: None

EXCUSED: Supervisor Valle & President Carson - 2

KEITH CARSON

President of the Board of Supervisors

County of Alameda, State of California

ATTEST: Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of Alameda

Approved as to Form

DONNA R. ZIEGLER, County Counsel

By: William M Fleishacker



Alameda County Fire Department
FIRE PREVENTION

www.acgov.org/fire

Exhibit 9

December 12, 2013

DEMETRIOS N. SHAFFER
Fire Chief

COUNTY
FIRE PREVENTION
399 Elmhurst, Room 120
Hayward, CA 94544
tel (510)670-5853
fax (510)887-5836

DUBLIN
FIRE PREVENTION
100 Civic Plaza
Dublin, CA 94568
Tel (925) 833-6606
Fax (925) 829-9248

EMERYVILLE
FIRE PREVENTION
1333 Park Avenue
Emeryville, CA 94608
Tel (510) 596-3759
Fax (510) 450-7812

NEWARK
FIRE PREVENTION
37101 Newark Blvd.
Newark, CA 94560
Tel (510) 578-4218
Fax (510) 578-4281

SAN LEANDRO
FIRE PREVENTION
835 E. 14th Street
San Leandro, CA 94577
Tel (510) 577-3317
Fax (510) 577-3419

UNION CITY
FIRE PREVENTION
34009 Alvarado-Niles Road
Union City, CA 94587
Tel (510) 675-5470
Fax (510) 441-2943

TO:	Marc Crawford	CC	
FROM:	Alameda County Fire Prevention Office		
SUBJECT:	17860 Almond Road, Private Road Map		



The private road map is approved as submitted.

Conditions of Approval

- 1. The roadway must be able to support 75,000 lbs gross vehicle weight in all weather conditions. The applicant is to provide verification to the fire department in the form of a letter from a licensed engineer.*
- 2. Any development on the parcels will be required to comply with all requirements set forth in Chapter 7A of the building code in effect at the time of permit submittal.*
- 3. Any development plans will need to include an additional hydrant along the Almond frontage, structured equipped with fire sprinklers, , fire resistive fencing, fire resistive plants, and a vegetation management plan*

ALL IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS AND PLANS INDICATED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY, AND THE PROPERTY OF THIS OFFICE AND WERE CREATED, EVOLVED AND DEVELOPED FOR USE ON, AND IN CONNECTION WITH THE SPECIFIED PROJECT. NONE OF SUCH IDEAS, DESIGNS, ARRANGEMENTS OR PLANS SHALL BE USED BY OR DISCLOSED TO ANY PERSON, FIRM OR CORPORATION FOR ANY PURPOSE WHATSOEVER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF GREENWOOD & MOORE, INC. WRITTEN DIMENSIONS ON THESE DRAWINGS SHALL HAVE PRECEDENCE OVER SCALE DIMENSIONS. CONTRACTORS SHALL VERIFY AND BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS ON THE JOB. THIS OFFICE MUST BE NOTIFIED OF ANY VARIATION FROM THE DIMENSIONS AND CONDITIONS SHOWN BY THESE DRAWINGS. SHOP DETAILS OF ADEQUATE SCALE MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THIS OFFICE FOR APPROVAL BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH FABRICATION ON THE ITEMS SO NOTED.

Exhibit 10



CURVE #	LENGTH	RADIUS	DELTA
C1	16.29	10.00	Δ321.25°
C2	6.97	5.00	Δ79.4950°
C3	43.98	28.00	Δ90°00'00"
C4	43.98	28.00	Δ89°58'51"
C5	62.04	325.00	Δ10°56'15"
C6	12.70	40.00	Δ18°11'42"
C7	12.70	40.00	Δ18°11'42"

- KNOTES #**
- ON-STREET PARKING SPACE
 - COUNTY BARRICADE
 - RAMP
 - BIORETENTION AREA & STORM WATER DETENTION
 - RETAINING WALL
 - CURB AND GUTTER
 - NEW DRIVEWAY APRON AT ABERNETHY PROPERTY
 - RELOCATE (E) ENTRANCE GATE AT HARD ENTRANCE TO LOCATION SHOWN. COORDINATE NEW GATE LOCATION WITH HARD EXISTING PARK SIGN AS REQUIRED.
 - FIRE TURN AROUND
 - STAIRS WITH HANDRAIL AND GATE TO PROVIDE MAINTENANCE AND INSPECTION ACCESS TO BIORETENTION AREA.
 - SIDEWALK
 - STREET LIGHT
 - DRIVEWAY APRON
 - NEW FENCE
 - APPROXIMATE LIMIT OF PROPOSED AC PAVING IN COUNTY ROW. PAVING TO BE CONSTRUCTED TO COUNTY STANDARDS.
 - NEW RETAINING WALL AS REQUIRED
 - RED CURB WITH WORDING "NO PARKING FIRE LANE" PER FIRE DEPARTMENT REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS.
 - RESIDENCE IS REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED WITH A FIRE SPRINKLER SYSTEM MEETING NFPA13D STANDARDS.
 - PROPERTY TO BE DEDICATED TO COUNTY
 - PROPERTY OWNED BY OTHERS AND NOT CURRENTLY IN THE PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY.

<p>SITE PLAN</p> <p>CHECKED BY: JM</p> <p>DRAWN BY: JM</p> <p>SCALE: 1"=20'</p> <p>DATE: 1/02/2014</p> <p>PROJECT NO: 2012.026</p> <p>PHASE NO:</p> <p>SHEET NO: 3</p>	<p>VESTING TENTATIVE</p> <p>PARCEL MAP 10193</p> <p>APN 084C-1062-062</p> <p>CASTRO VALLEY, ALAMEDA COUNTY</p>		<p>GREENWOOD & MOORE, INC</p> <p>Civil Engineers • Designers Land Surveyors • Planners</p> <p>3111 Castro Valley Blvd., Ste. 200, Castro Valley, California, 94546 Tel: 510-581-2772 Fax: 510-581-6913 www.greenwoodmoore.com</p>
---	--	--	--



Alameda County Fire Department

Fire Prevention Bureau

Review Comments

399 Elmhurst Street Rm. 120, Hayward, California 94544 (510) 670-5853 Fax (510) 887-5836

Address	Almond Road – Temp Lot 1	BLD#	13-3000	FD #	
Business	New Residence			Occ. Class	R-3
Job Description	New SFD				
Contact Person	Crawford Incorporated	Contact #	(510) 881-7856	Fax	
Fire Department Contact	Robert Snodgrass (510) 670-5853	Date	1/3/14	Review #	1

WITH CUSTOMER FOR RESPONSE

Re-submittal Required. A re-submittal is required for this project. Submit your response to the building department. Include an itemized response to each comment and where in the submittals the specific change or information can be found. Cloud all changes and provide a revision date.

CORRECTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS REQUIRED.

Include an itemized response to each comment and where in the submittals the specific change or information can be found. Cloud all changes and provide a revision date.

1. A Deferred Submittal Heading is needed for the required NFPA 13D Fire Sprinkler System.
Response: _____

2. This Project is in the Very High Fire Severity Zone of the Local Response Area. As such, it must meet the requirements of Chapter 47 of the California Building Fire and Chapter 7A of the California Building Code 2010 edition. This would include windows, doors, vents, and the deck on the rear.
Response: _____

3. For parcels less than acre in the Very High Fire Severity Zone of the Local Response Area shall provide the same practical effect as a 30 foot setback if it cannot be achieved.
Response: _____

4. Provide more information on the basement area which is accessible from the garage. This area may require sprinkler protection for this area.
Response: _____

5. Provide a cut sheet for the roof vents and the basement vents to ensure that they do not require fire protection.
Response: _____

6. Identify on the site plan the location of the closet hydrant.

Response: _____

Exhibit 11



Alameda County Fire Department

Fire Prevention Bureau

Review Comments

Exhibit 11

399 Elmhurst Street Rm. 120, Hayward, California 94544 (510) 670-5853 Fax (510) 887-5836

Address	Almond Road – Temp Lot 2	BLD#	13-3001	FD #	
Business	New Residence			Occ. Class	R-3
Job Description	New SFD				
Contact Person	Crawford Incorporated	Contact #	(510) 881-7856	Fax	
Fire Department Contact	Robert Snodgrass (510) 670-5853	Date	1/3/14	Review #	1

WITH CUSTOMER FOR RESPONSE

Re-submittal Required. A re-submittal is required for this project. Submit your response to the building department. Include an itemized response to each comment and where in the submittals the specific change or information can be found. Cloud all changes and provide a revision date.

CORRECTIONS/CLARIFICATIONS REQUIRED.

Include an itemized response to each comment and where in the submittals the specific change or information can be found. Cloud all changes and provide a revision date.

1. A Deferred Submittal Heading is needed for the required NFPA 13D Fire Sprinkler System.
Response: _____

2. This Project is in the Very High Fire Severity Zone of the Local Response Area. As such, it must meet the requirements of Chapter 47 of the California Building Fire and Chapter 7A of the California Building Code 2010 edition. This would include windows, doors, vents, and the deck on the rear.
Response: _____

3. For parcels less than acre in the Very High Fire Severity Zone of the Local Response Area shall provide the same practical effect as a 30 foot setback if it cannot be achieved.
Response: _____

4. Provide more information on the basement area which is accessible from the garage. This area may require sprinkler protection for this area.
Response: _____

5. Provide a cut sheet for the roof vents and the basement vents to ensure that they do not require fire protection.
Response: _____

6. Identify on the site plan the location of the closet hydrant.

Response: _____

This page has been intentionally left blank

ORDINANCE 2012-_____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 17 OF THE GENERAL ORDINANCE CODE OF THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA ADDRESSING AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEE HOUSING, MOBILEHOME PARKS, DENSITY BONUSES, TRANSITIONAL AND SUPPORTIVE HOUSING, RESIDENTIAL AND MEDICAL CARE FACILITIES, EMERGENCY SHELTERS AND SINGLE ROOM OCCUPANCY FACILITIES IN ORDER TO IMPLEMENT THE ALAMEDA COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT (2009-2014) AND TO CONFORM WITH STATE LAW

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda ordains as follows:

SECTION I

Section 17.04.010 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended by adding the following new definitions:

17.04.010 – Definitions.

“Agricultural employee” means a person engaged in agriculture, including: farming in all its branches, and, among other things, includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities (including commodities defined as agricultural commodities in Section 1141j(g) of Title 12 of the United States Code), the raising of livestock, bees, furbearing animals, or poultry, and any practices (including any forestry or lumbering operations) performed by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market and delivery to storage or to market or to carriers for transportation to market.

“Agricultural employee housing” means any living quarters or accommodations of any type, including mobilehomes, which comply with the building standards in the State Building Standards Code or an adopted local ordinance with equivalent minimum standards for building(s) used for human habitation, and buildings accessory thereto, where accommodations are provided by any person for individuals employed in farming or other agricultural activities, including such individuals’ families. The agricultural employee housing is not required to be located on the same property where the agricultural employee is employed.

“Emergency shelter” means housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that is limited to occupancy of six months or less by a homeless person.

“SRO (single room occupancy) facility” means a building containing six or more SRO units or guestrooms, designed for occupancy of no more than two persons, and which is intended, designed, or is used as a primary residence by guests.

“SRO (single room occupancy) unit” means a room that is used, intended or designed to be used by no more than two persons as a primary residence, but which lacks either or both a self-contained kitchen or bathroom.

“Supportive housing” means housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the “target population”, and that is linked to onsite or offsite services that assist the supportive housing resident in retaining the housing, improving his or her health status, and maximizing his or her ability to live and, when possible, work in the community.

"Target population" means persons with Low Income having one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV or AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health conditions, or individuals eligible for services provided under the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (California Welfare and Institutions Code, section 4500 et seq.) and may include, among other populations, adults, emancipated youth, families, families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, and homeless people.

"Transitional housing" and "transitional housing development" mean buildings configured as rental housing developments, but operated under program requirements that call for the termination of assistance and recirculation of the assisted unit to another eligible program recipient at some predetermined future point in time, which shall be no less than six months.

SECTION II

Section 17.04.010 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended by deleting the definitions of "Family Emergency Homeless Shelter" and "General Emergency Homeless Shelter."

SECTION III

Section 17.04.010 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended by revising the definition of "Medical or residential care facility" to read as follows:

17.04.010 – Definitions.

"Medical or residential care facility" means a residential care home as licensed by State Department of Social Services, Community Care Licensing Division. This term also includes group living quarters housing persons placed by an authorized agency for rehabilitation purposes and is funded by or licensed by or is operated under the auspices of an appropriate federal, state or county governmental agency.

SECTION IV

Section 17.06.030 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.06.030 - Permitted uses.

The following principal uses are permitted in an A district:

- A. On a building site, one one-family dwelling or one-family mobilehome either constructed after September 15, 1971, and issued an insignia of approval by the California Department of Housing and Community Development and permanently located on a permanent foundation system, or constructed after July 15, 1976, and issued an insignia of approval by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and permanently located on a foundation system;
- B. Crop, vine or tree farm, truck garden, plant nursery, greenhouse, apiary, aviary, hatchery, horticulture;
- C. Raising or keeping of poultry, fowl, rabbits, sheep or goats or similar animals;
- D. Grazing, breeding or training of horses or cattle;

- E. Winery or olive oil mill;
- F. Fish hatcheries and rearing ponds;
- G. Public or private riding or hiking trails;
- H. One secondary dwelling unit per building site on parcels twenty-five (25) acres in size or larger that are zoned for not more than one dwelling and have one but no more than one dwelling unit on the parcel subject to the following requirements:
 - 1. The secondary dwelling unit shall be on the same building envelope as the primary unit;
 - 2. On parcels less than one hundred (100) acres, the secondary dwelling unit shall be no larger than two thousand (2,000) square feet in area; on parcels one hundred (100) acres or larger the secondary dwelling unit shall be no larger than two thousand five hundred (2,500) square feet in area;
 - 3. The secondary dwelling unit shall be subject to site development review pursuant to Section 17.54.210 et seq.; and
 - 4. The secondary dwelling unit shall be subject to and consistent with the provisions of the county policy on secondary dwelling units in agricultural and rural residential areas. Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 17.54.220.A, for secondary units on parcels that are less than one hundred (100) acres in size, the planning commission shall decide applications for site development review under this section, and a public hearing is required.
- I. Occupancy of agricultural caretaker dwelling(s) subject to a site development review as provided in Section 17.06.090, when found by the planning director to be necessary to provide housing for the agricultural caretaker and his/her family.
- J. Boarding stables and riding academies subject to the following requirements:
 - 1. The boarding stable shall be subject to site development review pursuant to Sections 17.06.090 and 17.54.210 et seq., except as follows:
 - a. The appropriate board of zoning adjustments shall decide applications for site development review under this section, and a public hearing is required.
 - b. Where the holder of an existing conditional use permit is found to be in compliance with all conditions of the existing conditional use permit, the planning director shall recommend approval of a site development review for the facility Alameda County Ordinance Code, Title 17, Zoning Ordinance with no new conditions except as allowed by the county policy for equine facilities in the A (agricultural) district, to the appropriate board of zoning adjustments.
 - c. The planning director may modify the requirements of Section 17.54.230 consistent with the provisions of the county policy of equine facilities in the A (agricultural) district; and specifically may waive the requirement that the site plan be prepared by licensed civil engineer, land surveyor, architect, landscape architect, or a registered building designer.
 - 2. The boarding stable shall be subject to and consistent with the provisions of the county policy for equine facilities in the A (agricultural) district.
 - 3. Site development reviews under this section shall not have an expiration date. However, they shall be subject to a periodic review for compliance with conditions of approval of the site development review and with relevant county ordinances, including all water quality rules and regulations. Such reviews shall occur every five years at minimum, or as needed to ensure compliance.
 - 4. Any changes in the scope of the boarding stable operation shall require a modification to the site development review.
 - 5. Site development review approval under this section shall not be construed to confer upon a boarding stable any exemption from any health, nuisance, or public safety ordinances or their subsequent enforcement or confer any other unique privileges upon a stable.
- K. Agricultural employee housing consisting of not more than thirty-six (36) beds in a group quarters or twelve (12) units or spaces designed for use by a single family or household subject

to a site development review as provided in Section 17.06.090 (Agricultural Districts--Site Development Review—When Required), 17.06.100 (Agricultural Districts—Agricultural Employee Housing), and 17.54.210 (Site Development Review).

SECTION V

Section 17.06.040 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.06.040 - Conditional uses—Board of zoning adjustments.

In addition to the uses listed in Sections 17.52.480 and 17.52.580, the following are conditional uses and shall be permitted in an A district only if approved by the board of zoning adjustments, as provided in Sections 17.54.130 and 17.06.010:

- A. Outdoor recreation facility;
- B. Animal hospital, kennel;
- C. Killing and dressing of livestock, except when accessory as specified in Section 17.06.050;
- D. Public or private hunting of wildlife or fishing, and public or private hunting clubs and accessory structures;
- E. Packing house for fruit or vegetables, but not including a cannery, or a plant for food processing or freezing;
- F. Flight strip when accessory or incidental to a permitted or conditional use;
- G. Hog ranch;
- H. Drilling for and removal of oil, gas or other hydrocarbon substances;
- I. Radio and television transmission facilities;
- J. Public utility building or uses, excluding such uses as a business office, storage garage, repair shop or corporation yard;
- K. Administrative offices accessory to the principal use on the premises including activities by the same occupancy which are not related to the principal use providing such activities not so related are accessory to the administrative office activity;
- L. Administrative support and service facilities of a public regional recreation district;
- M. Privately owned wind-electric generators;
- N. Remote testing facility;
- O. Winery or olive oil mill related uses; and
- P. Agricultural employee housing for 37 or more beds in group quarters or 13 units or spaces designed for use by a single family or household.

SECTION VI

Section 17.06.090 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.06.090 - Site development review—When required.

Site development review pursuant to Section 17.54.210 shall be required for:

- A. Every new dwelling or addition to existing dwelling exceeding five hundred (500) square feet or thirty (30) feet in height hereafter placed on a parcel in the A district;
- B. Agricultural caretakers dwelling(s), when found by the planning director to be necessary to provide housing for the agricultural caretaker and his/her/their family(ies); subject to the following provisions:

1. Initial site development review shall include submittal of required applications and materials and completion of an agricultural caretaker dwelling report, signed by the property owner.

2. The agricultural caretaker dwelling report submitted under Paragraph 1 above shall include a description of the agricultural use on the site, a description of the commercial/economic viability of the agricultural use, a discussion of the personnel necessary to implement or oversee the agricultural use, and a description of the proposed agricultural dwelling and/or housing. If the agricultural use is intended primarily for private interest rather than commercial viability, or if the dwelling unit is intended for a use not otherwise related directly to commercially viable agriculture on the site, such as onsite security, the report shall provide this information.

3. Site development review approval shall normally be issued for a period of five years, except in instances where it is found by the planning director that a demonstrable need for more stringent controls (e.g., history of non-compliance with county codes, public health/safety issues, community concerns) is necessary.

4. The planning director may extend initial site development review for additional five-year periods of time at the end of each preceding five-year period, subject to review and approval, of an updated agricultural caretaker dwelling report, signed by the property owner.

5. During the effective period of the site development review, any changes relating to the information contained in the agricultural caretaker dwelling report (including changes to the dwelling unit itself, changes in maximum occupancy requirements, and/or changes in the size/nature/ scope of the agricultural use being served by the presence of the caretaker onsite) shall be reported to the planning department, and shall be subject to the same procedures and regulations as those applicable to the initial application.

6. The planning director shall have the discretion to disapprove the initial and/or subsequent site development review and agricultural caretaker dwelling report if found that compliance with the requirements and intent set forth in this title is exercised unlawfully or contrary to any condition or limitation of its issuance.

7. The planning director may, at his/her discretion, hold a public hearing regarding an initial or subsequent site development review application.

8. The approval of a site development review for an agricultural caretaker dwelling of any kind on any parcel, regardless of the existing legal building site status of the parcel, shall not be construed to establish upon that same, or any adjacent or commonly-owned parcel, building site status.

9. The agricultural caretaker dwelling is intended to remain only as long as necessary to support either onsite security or the primary agriculture use on the site, and when the need for this support terminates the dwelling must be completely removed or converted to another legal use.

10. Violations of this section shall be subject to enforcement, penalties and abatement under Chapters 17.58 and 17.59 of this title.

C. Boarding stables and riding academies subject to the provisions of Section 17.06.030J of this chapter; and

D. Agricultural employee housing subject to the provisions of Section 17.06.100 of this chapter.

SECTION VII

Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended by adding the following new Section 17.06.100:

17.06.100 – Agricultural Districts—Agricultural employee housing.

Agricultural employee housing is subject to site development review pursuant to Sections 17.06.060 (Agricultural Districts--Site Development Review—When Required) and 17.54.210 (Site Development Review) et seq. and to the following provisions:

A. The site development review shall include submittal of required applications and materials

including an agricultural employee housing report, signed by the property owner.

B. The agricultural employee housing report submitted under Paragraph 1 above shall include the following information:

1. Entity responsible for housing maintenance and up-keep;
2. Description of whether the housing will be used on a permanent, temporary, and/or seasonal basis;
3. Total number of people to be housed on-site at any one time;
4. Description of the housing, including whether the structures will be permanent and/or temporary, intended as units for families, one person, or several persons, and cost of the units and utilities to the agricultural employees;
5. Location(s) where the agricultural employees will work;
6. There must be adequate water and sewer available to service the development, as determined by the Department of Environmental Health;
7. The housing must be located off prime and productive agricultural land, or on the parcel where no other alternatives exist on site, on the least viable portion of the parcel;
8. The development shall incorporate proper erosion and drainage controls; and
9. Parking shall be provided in accordance with Section 17.52.910 (Parking spaces required—Residential buildings).

C. Site development review approval shall normally be issued for a period of five years, except in instances where it is found by the planning director that a demonstrable need for more stringent controls (e.g., history of non-compliance with county codes, public health/safety issues, community concerns) is necessary.

D. The planning director may extend the initial site development review for additional five-year periods of time at the end of each preceding five-year period, subject to review and approval, of an updated agricultural employee housing report, signed by the property owner.

E. During the effective period of the site development review, any changes relating to the information contained in the agricultural employee housing report (including changes to the dwelling unit itself, and changes in maximum occupancy requirements) shall be reported to the planning department, and shall be subject to the same procedures and regulations as those applicable to the initial application.

F. The planning director shall have the discretion to disapprove the initial and/or subsequent site development review and agricultural employee housing report if found that compliance with the requirements and intent set forth in this title is exercised unlawfully or contrary to any condition or limitation of its issuance.

G. The planning director may, at his/her discretion, hold a public hearing regarding an initial or subsequent site development review application.

H. The approval of a site development review for an agricultural employee housing of any kind on any parcel, regardless of the existing legal building site status of the parcel, shall not be construed to establish upon that same, or any adjacent or commonly-owned parcel, building site status.

I. Violations of this section shall be subject to enforcement, penalties and abatement under Chapters 17.58 and 17.59 of this title.

SECTION VIII

Section 17.08.030 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.08.030 - Permitted uses.

The following principal uses are permitted in an R-1 district:

- A. One one-family dwelling;

- B. Field crop, orchard, garden;
- C. Medical or residential care facility for up to six (6) persons per unit; and
- D. Licensed transitional or supportive housing for up to six (6) persons per unit.

SECTION IX

Section 17.08.040 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.08.040 - Conditional uses.

In addition to the uses listed in Sections 17.52.480 and 17.52.580, the following are conditional uses in an R-1 district, and shall be permitted only if approved by the board of zoning adjustments as provided in Section 17.54.130:

- A. Community facility;
- B. Community clubhouse;
- C. Parking lot, only when established to fulfill the residential parking requirements of this title for a use on an abutting lot or lots;
- D. Plant nursery or greenhouse used only for the cultivation and wholesale of plant materials;
- E. Medical or residential care facility for seven (7) or more persons per unit as regulated in Section 17.54.133 (Conditional Uses- Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities);
- F. Licensed transitional or supportive housing for seven (7) or more persons per unit as regulated in Section 17.54.133 (Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities);and
- G. Mobilehome parks subject to the provisions provided in sections 17.52.1000 to 17.52.1065.

SECTION X

Section 17.10.020 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.10.020 - Permitted uses.

The following principal uses are permitted in an R-2 district:

- A. One or two one-family dwellings, or one two-family dwelling;
- B. Field crop, orchard, or garden;
- C. Medical or residential care facility for up to six (6) persons per unit; and
- D. Licensed transitional or supportive housing for up to six (6) persons per unit.

SECTION XI

Section 17.10.030 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.10.030 - Conditional uses.

In addition to the uses listed in Sections 17.52.480 and 17.52.580, the following are conditional uses in R-2 districts, and shall be permitted only if approved by the board of zoning adjustments as provided in Section 17.54.130:

- A. Community facility;
- B. Community clubhouse;
- C. Parking lot, subject to the same limitations as in Section 17.08.040C;
- D. Plant nursery, or greenhouse used only for the cultivation of plant materials;

- E. Medical or residential care facility for seven (7) or more persons per unit as regulated in Section 17.54.133 (Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities);
- F. One dwelling or a dwelling group containing altogether not more than three dwelling units, where the lot has an area not less than seven thousand five hundred (7,500) square feet.;
- G. Licensed transitional or supportive housing for seven (7) or more persons per unit as regulated in Section 17.54.133 (Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities); and
- H. Mobilehome parks subject to the provisions provided in sections 17.52.1000 to 17.52.1065.

SECTION XII

Section 17.12.030 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.12.030 - Permitted uses.

The following principal uses are permitted in any R-S district:

- A. One-family dwelling, two-family dwelling, multiple dwelling or dwelling group;
- B. Field crop, orchard, garden;
- C. Medical or residential care facility for up to six (6) persons per unit; and
- D. Licensed transitional or supportive housing for up to six (6) persons per unit.

SECTION XIII

Section 17.12.040 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.12.040 - Conditional uses—Board of zoning adjustments.

In addition to the uses listed in Sections 17.52.480 and 17.52.580, the following are conditional uses in R-S districts, and shall be permitted only if approved by the board of zoning adjustments as provided in Section 17.54.130:

- A. Community facility;
- B. Community clubhouse;
- C. Parking lot, as regulated in Section 17.08.040C;
- D. Plant nursery or greenhouse used only for the cultivation of plant materials;
- E. Medical or residential care facility for seven (7) or more persons per unit as regulated in Section 17.54.133 (Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities);
- F. Mobilehome parks, as regulated by Chapter 17.52, Sections 1000-1065, of this title; and
- G. Licensed transitional and supportive housing for seven (7) or more persons per unit as regulated in Section 17.54.133 (Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities).

SECTION XIV

Section 17.14.020 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.14.020 - Permitted uses.

The following principal uses are permitted in an R-3 district:

- A. One-family dwelling, two-family dwelling, multiple dwelling, or dwelling group, up to a total not to exceed four dwelling units;
- B. Field crop, orchard, garden;
- C. Medical or residential care facility for up to six (6) persons per unit; and
- D. Licensed transitional or supportive housing for up to six (6) persons per unit.

SECTION XV

Section 17.14.030 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.14.030 - Conditional uses—Board of zoning adjustments.

In addition to the uses listed for Sections 17.52.480 and 17.52.580, the following are conditional uses in R-3 districts, and shall be permitted only if approved by the board of zoning adjustments as provided in Section 17.54.130:

- A. Community facility;
- B. Community clubhouse;
- C. Medical or residential care facility for seven (7) or more persons as regulated in Section 17.54.133 (Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities);
- D. Plant nursery, or greenhouse used only for the cultivation of plant materials;
- E. Parking lot, as regulated in Section 17.08.040C;
- F. Licensed transitional and supportive housing for seven (7) or more persons per unit as regulated in Section 17.54.133 (Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities); and
- G. Mobilehome parks subject to the provisions provided in sections 17.52.1000 to 17.52.1065.

SECTION XVI

Section 17.16.020 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.16.020 - Permitted uses.

The following principal uses are permitted in an R-4 district:

- A. All uses permitted in R-3 districts, pursuant to Section 17.14.020;
- B. Multiple dwelling or dwelling group, provided that on any building site with an area which equals or exceeds five times the area for one dwelling unit, every dwelling unit placed on such building site shall be subject to site development review pursuant to Section 17.54.210; and
- C. Emergency shelter provided in accordance with Section 17.52.1165 (Emergency Shelter-Regulations)

SECTION XVII

Section 17.16.030 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.16.030 - Conditional uses—Board of zoning adjustments.

In addition to the uses listed for Sections 17.52.480 and 17.52.580, the following are conditional uses in an R-4 district, and shall be permitted only if approved by the board of zoning adjustments as provided in Section 17.54.130:

- A. Community facility;

- B. Parking lot, as regulated in Section 17.08.040C;
- C. Clubhouse;
- D. Medical or residential care facility for seven (7) or more persons as regulated in Section 17.54.133 (Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities);
- E. Boarding house;
- F. Fraternity or sorority house, accredited by an institution of higher learning;
- G. Single room occupancy facility subject to the provisions of 17.54.134 (Conditional Uses- Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Facilities);
- H. Licensed transitional and supportive housing for seven (7) or more persons per unit as regulated in Section 17.54.133 (Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities); and
- I. Mobilehome parks subject to the provisions provided in sections 17.52.1000 to 17.52.1065.

SECTION XVIII

Table 17.52.910 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

Table 17.52.910 Parking Spaces Required for Residential Buildings	
Use	Number of Spaces Required
Dwelling, including single, two-family and multiple residences, group dwellings, apartment houses, apartment hotels, and all other similar structures devoted to habitation	2 for each dwelling unit, plus 1 for each bedroom available for accommodating a paying guest
Hotel, motel, boarding house, clubhouse, fraternity or sorority, and single room occupancy facilities	2 plus 1 for each bedroom available for sorority; accommodating guests a paying guest
Medical or residential care facility, and transitional and supportive housing developments	2 plus 1 for each 6 beds for persons not related to the resident family or manager
Hospital	2 plus 1 for each 4 patient beds, (except that those patient beds designated as "long term care beds" by the State Department of Public Health may be computed 1 per 6 patient beds) plus 1 for each staff doctor; plus 1 for each 1,000 square feet of gross floor area in the main building or buildings
Mobilehome park	2 for each mobilehome site; other provisions of this title notwithstanding, the access to one of these spaces may be within the access to the second space; plus 1 for each 10 mobilehome sites
Recreational vehicle park	1 for each recreational vehicle site located on each recreational vehicle site, plus 1 for each 15 recreational vehicle sites

Emergency shelter	3 plus 1 per each 10 individual beds.
Agricultural employee housing	1 space per unit, or 1 for each 4 beds

SECTION XIX

Section 17.52.1020 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.52.1020 - Mobilehome parks—Density.

Except as otherwise provided in a combining district or specific plan, the number of dwelling units permitted on a building site in a mobilehome park shall not exceed the number obtained by dividing the area in square feet of the building site by five thousand (5,000), disregarding any fraction.

SECTION XX

Section 17.52.1065 of Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended to read as follows:

17.52.1065 - Mobilehome parks—Parking.

Pursuant to Section 17.52.910 (Parking spaces required—Residential buildings), every mobilehome site shall have two parking spaces. A mobilehome park shall also provide 1 parking space for every 10 mobilehome sites.

SECTION XXI

Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended by adding the following new Section 17.52.1160:

17.52.1160 – Standards for Emergency Shelters —Purpose.

The purpose of this Section is to establish the development standards for Emergency Shelters

SECTION XXII

Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended by adding the following new Section 17.52.1165:

17.52.1165 – Emergency Shelter —Regulations.

Emergency Shelters shall be subject to the following regulations and development standards:

- A. An Emergency Shelter shall obtain and maintain in good standing all required licenses, permits, and approvals from County and State agencies or departments. An Emergency Shelter shall comply with all County and State health and safety requirements for food, medical, and other supportive services provided on-site;
- B. No Emergency Shelter facility shall have more than sixty (60) beds;
- C. Each resident shall be provided a minimum of fifty (50) gross square feet of personal living space, not including space for common areas;
- D. Bathing facilities shall be provided in quantity and location as required in the California Plumbing Code (Title 24 Part 5), as amended, and shall comply with the accessibility requirements of the California Building Code (Title 24 Part 2), as amended;

- E. No individual or family shall reside in an Emergency Shelter for more than 180 consecutive days;
- F. The operation of buses or vans to transport residents to or from off-site activities shall not generate vehicular traffic substantially greater than that normally generated by residential activities in the surrounding area, to the satisfaction of the Planning Director;
- G. The on-street parking demand generated by the facility due to visitors shall not be substantially greater than that normally generated by the surrounding residential activities, to the satisfaction of the Planning Director;
- H. Arrangements for delivery of goods shall be made within the hours that are compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability of the surrounding properties;
- I. The facility's program shall not generate noise at levels that will adversely affect the livability of the surrounding properties, and shall at all times maintain compliance with the County Noise Ordinance;
- J. Onsite management shall be provided twenty-four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days per week. All facilities must provide a management plan to the satisfaction of the Planning Director that shall contain policies, maintenance plans, intake procedures, tenant rules, and security procedures;
- K. The facility is no closer than three hundred (300) feet from other emergency shelters unless findings can be made that such an additional facility would not have a negative impact upon residential activities in the surrounding area;
- L. On-site parking shall be provided in accordance with Section 17.52.910;
- M. The facilities shall provide exterior lighting in the parking lot, on building exteriors, and pedestrian accesses. All exterior lighting shall be down-cast and shall not illuminate above the horizontal. No light source shall be exposed above the horizontal, nor visible from neighboring residential use properties.
- N. Required yards shall conform with the R-4 zoning district yard requirements; and
- O. A waiting and client intake area of not less than one hundred (100) square feet shall be provided inside the main building.
- P. Violations of this section shall be subject to enforcement, penalties and abatement under Chapters 17.58 and 17.59 of this title.

SECTION XXIII

Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended by adding the following new Section 17.54.133:

17.54.133 – Conditional Uses- Residential, Medical Care, Transitional and Supportive Housing Facilities.

In addition to the findings required of the Board of Zoning Adjustments under Sections 17.54.130 (Conditional Uses) and 17.54.140 (Conditional Uses--Action), a conditional use permit for any conditionally permitted residential or medical care facility, transitional housing facility, or supportive housing facility may only be granted upon determination that the proposal conforms to all of the following additional use permit criteria:

- A. Staffing of the facility shall at all times remain in compliance with any State Licensing Agency requirements;
- B. The operation of buses or vans to transport residents to or from off-site activities shall not generate vehicular traffic substantially greater than that normally generated by residential activities in the surrounding area;
- C. The on-street parking demand generated by the facility due to visitors shall not be substantially greater than that normally generated by the surrounding residential activities;

- D. Arrangements for delivery of goods shall be made within the hours that are compatible with and will not adversely affect the livability of the surrounding properties;
- E. That the facility's program shall not generate noise at levels that will adversely affect the livability of the surrounding properties, and shall at all times maintain compliance with the County Noise Ordinance;
- F. Onsite management shall be provided twenty-four (24) hours a day, seven days per week. Prior to operation, all facilities must provide to the Planning Director a management plan that shall contain policies, maintenance plans, rental procedures, tenant rules, and security procedures;
- G. In accordance with sections 1267.9 and 1520.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, no facility shall be closer than three hundred (300) feet from other similar activities or facilities unless findings can be made that such an additional facility would not have a negative impact upon residential activities in the surrounding area;
- H. Parking shall be provided in accordance with Section 17.52.910 (Parking Spaces required—Residential buildings);
- I. The facilities shall provide exterior lighting in the parking lot, on building exteriors, and pedestrian accesses. All exterior lighting shall be down-cast and shall not illuminate above the horizontal. No light source shall be exposed above the horizontal, nor visible from neighboring residential use properties; and
- J. Yards shall conform to the zoning requirements established for the district in which it is located.

SECTION XXIV

Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended by adding the following new 17.54.134:

17.54.134 – Conditional Uses- Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Facilities.

Single Room Occupancy Facilities shall be subject to the following regulations and development standards:

- A. Excluding the bathroom area and closet(s), the Single Room Occupancy unit must be a minimum of one hundred and fifty (150) square feet in floor area and the maximum size shall be not more than four hundred (400) square feet. Each unit shall be designed to accommodate a maximum of two people.
- B. Each Single Room Occupancy Unit must include a closet and may contain either kitchen facilities or bath facilities but not both.
- C. Complete common cooking facilities/kitchens must be provided if any unit within the SRO Facility does not have a kitchen. One complete cooking facility/kitchen shall be provided within the SRO Facility for every twenty (20) SRO units or portion thereof that do not have kitchens, or have one kitchen on any floor where SRO Units without kitchens are located.
- D. Common bathrooms must be located on any floor with any unit that does not have a full bathroom. Common bathrooms shall be either single occupant use with provisions for privacy or multi-occupant use with separate provisions for men and women. Common bathrooms shall have shower or bathtub facilities at a ratio of one for every seven (7) units or fraction thereof. Each shared shower or bathtub facility shall be provided with an interior lockable door.
- E. Each SRO Facility shall have at least ten (10) square feet of common usable area per unit; however no SRO facility shall provide less than two hundred (200) square feet of common outdoor area and two hundred (200) square feet of common indoor area. Maintenance areas, laundry facilities, storage (including bicycle storage), and common hallways shall not be included as usable indoor common space. Landscape areas that are less than eight (8) feet wide shall not be included as outdoor common space.

- F. A SRO Facility with twelve (12) or more units shall provide twenty-four (24) hour on-site management, and include a dwelling unit designated for the manager. All SRO Facilities must have a management plan approved prior to occupation by the Alameda County Department of Housing and Community Development. The management plan shall contain management policies, maintenance plans, rental procedures, tenant rules, and security procedures.
- G. Single Room Occupancy Facilities shall include laundry facilities.
- H. A cleaning supply storeroom and/or utility closet with at least one (1) laundry tub with hot and cold running water must be provided on each floor of the SRO Facility.
- I. Parking shall be provided in accordance with Section 17.52.910.

SECTION XXV

Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended by deleting Chapter 17.56 (Density Bonus) in its entirety.

SECTION XXVI

Title 17 of the General Ordinance Code of the County of Alameda is amended by adding the following new Chapter 17.106 (Density Bonus):

Chapter 17.106- DENSITY BONUS

17.106.010- Title.

This chapter shall be called the density bonus ordinance of the county of Alameda.

17.106.020 – Purpose.

This chapter establishes policies which facilitate the development of affordable housing for very low and lower income households and senior households within the unincorporated area of Alameda County, through the provision of a density bonus, and additional financial incentives if necessary for affordability, to applicants who agree to meet the requirements established by this chapter.

17.106.030 – Definitions.

For the purposes of this chapter, certain words and phrases shall be interpreted as set forth in this section unless it is apparent from the context that a different meaning is intended.

Affordable Housing Agreement: means the agreement made between the applicant and the county governing the regulation and monitoring of the affordable units.

Amenities: means interior amenities including, but not limited to, fireplaces, garbage disposals, dishwashers, cabinets and storage space and bathrooms in excess of one.

Applicant: means any person, firm, partnership, association, joint venture, corporation, or any entity or combination of entities which seeks a density bonus or incentives or both under this chapter.

Base Units: means the number of units that would be allowed under the General Plan land use designation and zoning ordinance for the subject site before calculation of the Density Bonus.

Child Care Facility: means a facility, other than a day care home, licensed by the State of California to provide non-medical care to children under 18 years of age in need of personal services, supervision or assistance on less than a 24-hour basis.

Density Bonus: means an increase in density over the otherwise maximum allowable residential density under the applicable zoning ordinance and General Plan land use designation.

Density Bonus Unit: means a residential dwelling unit authorized as a result of the granting of a density bonus.

Household: means one person living alone or two or more persons sharing a residential dwelling.

Housing Development: means a project providing residential units including, without limitation, a subdivision, a planned unit development, multifamily dwellings, or condominium project. Housing developments consist of development of residential units or creation of unimproved residential lots and also include either a project to substantially rehabilitate and convert an existing commercial building to residential use or the substantial rehabilitation of an existing multifamily dwelling, where the result of the rehabilitation would be a net increase in available residential units.

Incentive: An "Incentive" may include any of the following:

1. Approval of a mixed-use development if commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses will help to offset the costs of the housing development. A mixed-use development will be approved only if the commercial, office, industrial, or other land uses are compatible with the surrounding land uses, the county general plan, and applicable specific plans;
2. Government-assisted financing, including, but not limited to, mortgage revenue bonds issued by the county;
3. A reduction in site development standards, but only if the overall quality of the development is not lessened. All developments must also meet any design guidelines codified by the county at a future date;
4. Other incentives proposed by the developer or the county which result in identifiable cost reductions, including but not limited to:
 - a. Waiver or reduction of certain county fees applicable to restricted units in a housing development,
 - b. Reduction of interior amenities,
 - c. Priority processing of a housing development which provides restricted units. Upon certification that the application is complete and eligible for priority processing, the housing development will be reviewed by the planning director in advance of all nonpriority items. The housing development review will be completed and a recommendation will be made by the planning director whether to approve the housing development within one hundred twenty (120) days of receipt of the completed application. The planning director may give written approval to extend the one hundred twenty (120) day period.

Lower Income Household: means a household whose gross income is eighty (80) percent or less of the Alameda County median income adjusted for household size, computed pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 50079.5; if the Health and Safety Code definition is amended, this definition shall be deemed to be amended to the same effect.

Maximum Allowable Residential Density: means the density allowed under the General Plan, or if a range of density is permitted, means the maximum allowable density for the specific zoning range applicable to the project. Maximum allowable residential density takes into account limitations to density pursuant to General Plan policies and Zoning Ordinance regulations.

Median Income: means the median income for Alameda County, published by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Moderate Income Household: means a household, with an annual income which does not exceed the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development annual determination for moderate income households with incomes of one hundred twenty (120) percent of the Median Income, adjusted for household size.

Qualifying Unit: means a dwelling or dwellings designated for occupancy by very low, low, or moderate income households, within a housing development, which make the housing development eligible for a Density Bonus.

Resale controls: means a resale restriction placed on restricted units by which the price of such units and/or the age or income of the purchaser will be restricted to ensure affordability and occupancy by very low or lower income households or senior households.

Restricted Unit: means a residential dwelling unit to be sold or rented at a price or rent affordable to a very low, lower, or moderate income household, or sold or rented to a senior household.

Senior Citizen Housing Development: means a housing community governed by a common set of rules, regulations or restrictions, consisting of at least thirty-five (35) dwelling units reserved for Senior Citizen Households as further described in California Civil Code Sections 51.3 and 51.12.

Senior Household: means as established by California Civil Code Section 51.3, a household in which at least one member is at least sixty-two (62) years of age.

Term of Affordability: means the time during which restricted units in a housing development must remain as restricted units.

Unit Type: means a dwelling unit with a defined floor area and a designated number of bedrooms.

Very Low Income Household: means a household whose gross income is fifty (50) percent or less of the Alameda County median income adjusted for household size, computed pursuant to California Health and Safety Code Section 50079.5.

17. 106.040 - Density bonus qualifications.

In order to qualify for a density bonus and one or more incentives under this chapter, a housing development must consist of five or more dwelling units and meet one or more of the following criteria:

- A. Agrees to construct and maintain at least five (5) percent of the base units for very low income households;
- B. Agrees to construct and maintain at least ten (10) percent of the base units for lower income households;
- C. Agrees to construct and maintain at least ten (10) percent of the base units in a condominium project or planned development project dedicated to moderate income households, provided that all units in the development are offered to the public for purchase;
- D. Agrees to construct and maintain a senior citizen housing development;

E. Converts an existing apartment or multifamily dwelling to a condominium development as described in Section 17.106.050.I (Density Bonus—Density Bonus Calculations).

17.106.050 - Density bonus calculations.

A. In accordance with state law, the granting of a Density Bonus or an incentive(s) shall not be interpreted, in and of itself, to require a General Plan amendment, specific plan amendment, rezone, or other discretionary approval.

B. An applicant must choose a Density Bonus from only one applicable affordability category of this Chapter and may not combine categories, with the exception of a Child Care Facility or land donation. The Child Care Facility or land donation may be combined with an affordable housing development for an additional Density Bonus up to a combined maximum of thirty five (35) percent.

C. Any Density Bonus and/or Concession/Incentive awarded shall apply only to the Housing Development for which it was granted.

D. In determining the number of density bonus units to be granted pursuant to 17.106.040 Section 17.106.040 (Density Bonus Qualifications), the maximum residential density for the site shall be multiplied by 0.20 for subsections A, B, and D of that section and 0.05 for subsection C of that section, unless a lesser number is selected by the developer.

1. For each one percent increase above ten percent in the percentage of units affordable to lower income households, the density bonus shall be increased by 1.5 percent up to a maximum of 35 percent.

2. For each one percent increase above five percent in the percentage of units affordable to very low income households, the density bonus shall be increased by 2.5 percent up to a maximum of 35 percent.

3. For each one percent increase above ten percent of the percentage of units affordable to moderate income households, the density bonus shall be increased by one (1) percent up to a maximum of 35 percent.

4. For a senior housing development that provides one hundred (100) percent of its units available to senior households, the density bonus shall be twenty (20) percent.

E. When calculating the number of permitted density bonus units, any calculations resulting in fractional units shall be rounded to the next larger integer.

F. The density bonus units shall not be included when determining the number of qualifying units required for a density bonus. When calculating the required number of qualifying units, any calculations resulting in fractional units shall be rounded to the next larger integer.

G. The developer may request a lesser density bonus than the project is entitled to, but no reduction will be permitted in the number of required qualifying units pursuant to Section 17.106.040 (Density bonus qualifications) above. Regardless of the number of qualifying units, no housing development may be entitled to a density bonus of more than thirty-five percent.

H. The following table summarizes this information:

Density Bonus Summary Table

Income Group	Minimum % Qualifying Units	Bonus Granted	Additional Bonus for Each 1% Increase in Qualifying Units	% Qualifying Units Required for Maximum 35% Bonus
Very Low Income	5%	20%	2.5%	11%
Low Income	10%	20%	1.5%	20%
Moderate Income (Condo or PD)	10%	5%	1%	40%

only)				
Senior Citizen Housing Development	100%	20%	—	—

I. An applicant for an apartment conversion to a condominium project that provides at least thirty-three (33) percent of the total units of the proposed condominium project to persons and families of Low or Moderate Income, or fifteen (15) percent of the total units of the project to Lower Income households, and agrees to pay for the reasonable necessary administrative costs incurred by the County, qualify for a twenty-five (25) percent Density Bonus or other incentives of equivalent financial value. An applicant shall be ineligible for a Density Bonus or other incentives if the apartments proposed for conversion constitute a housing development for which a Density Bonus or other Incentives were previously granted under the provisions of this chapter.

17.106.060 – Density Bonus--Eligibility and application requirements for incentives.

A. A housing development qualifying for a density bonus is entitled to at least one incentive in addition to the density bonus. Incentives are available for qualifying housing developments as follows:

1. One incentive or concession for projects that include at least ten (10) percent of the total units for lower income households, at least five (5) percent for very low income households, or at least ten (10) percent for persons and families of moderate income in a condominium or planned development.
2. Two incentives or concessions for projects that include at least twenty (20) percent of the total units for lower income households, at least ten (10) percent for very low income households, or at least twenty (20) percent for persons and families of moderate income in a condominium or planned development.
3. Three incentives or concessions for projects that include at least thirty (30) percent of the total units for lower income households, at least fifteen (15) percent for very low income households, or at least thirty (30) percent for persons and families of moderate income in a condominium or planned development.

B. The appropriate authority for the housing development shall grant the incentive unless the appropriate authority makes a written finding, based upon substantial evidence, of any of the following:

1. That the incentive is not necessary in order to provide for affordable housing costs; or
2. The concession or incentive would have a specific adverse impact, as defined in California Health & Safety Code Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environment or on any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific adverse impact without rendering the development unaffordable to very low, lower and moderate income households.

C. In accordance with Government Code Section 65915 (p), an applicant qualifying for a density bonus may request, inclusive of handicapped and guest parking, the following parking ratios:

1. Zero to one bedrooms: One onsite parking space
2. Two to three bedrooms: Two onsite parking spaces
3. Four or more bedrooms: Two and one-half parking spaces

These standards may be applied in addition to any other incentives for which the housing development qualifies as specified in this section. If the total number of parking spaces for the development is other than a whole number, the number shall be rounded up to the next whole number. Off-street parking spaces provided pursuant to this paragraph may be arranged in

tandem and may be uncovered.

17. 106.070 - Qualifications for restricted units.

- A. The applicant shall execute an affordable housing agreement with Alameda County, which shall be recorded and shall run with the land.
- B. The affordable housing agreement shall describe household types, number, location, size and construction scheduling of restricted units and any other information required by the county to determine the applicant's compliance with the conditions.
- C. Restricted units shall be constructed concurrently with or prior to the construction of nonrestricted units, shall be dispersed throughout the housing development, and shall include all unit types represented in the housing development and shall be in the same proportions as nonrestricted unit types.

17. 106.080 - Term of affordability.

The applicant shall agree to, and the County shall ensure, the continued availability of the Qualifying Units and other Incentives for a period of at least 30 (thirty) years, or a longer period of time if required by the construction or mortgage financing assistance program, mortgage insurance program, or rental subsidy program.

17. 106.090 - Requirements for rental housing developments.

- A. All restricted units shall be occupied by the household type specified in the affordable housing agreement.
- B. The applicant shall be responsible for obtaining and verifying information with respect to the qualifications of prospective and current tenants, including, but not limited to, information relating to tenants' incomes, and eligibility, in a form satisfactory to the planning director. The applicant shall maintain a list of qualified applicants for the duration of the program and shall allow the planning director to inspect such information upon reasonable notice. The applicant may contract with another entity to perform these functions subject to the approval of the planning director.
- C. The applicant shall submit reports annually certifying that the restricted units are occupied by the household types specified in the affordable housing agreement. The annual reports shall include the number of persons and income for each household in the restricted units.
- D. If the affordable housing agreement is violated, the applicant shall pay to the county as liquidated damages the maximum sum of five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) for each restricted unit that is in violation of the affordable housing agreement. This amount may be required for each month of violation. Any unpaid liquidated damages may be recorded as a notice of violation of the affordable housing agreement against the title of the property. In addition to the liquidated damages, if a very low income, moderate income or lower income household in a restricted unit is charged a rent that exceeds the rent specified in the affordable housing agreement, the applicant must pay to the tenant the difference in the rent charged and the allowable rent for the months that the tenant was overcharged. If a restricted unit is rented to a household with an income exceeding that specified in the affordable housing agreement, in lieu of the liquidated damages mentioned above, the first vacant nonrestricted unit must be made a restricted unit and rented to a household that qualifies under the affordable housing agreement.

17. 106.100 - Requirements for owner-occupied housing.

- A. The home buyer shall verify on a form provided by the planning director that the restricted unit being purchased is for use as the buyer's principal residence and that the buyer is either a moderate income household, lower income household, very low income household or a senior household. If the restricted unit ceases to function as the owner's principal residence, it shall be sold according to the requirements of the resale controls. If evidence is presented to the

planning director that the owner is unable to continuously occupy the restricted unit because of illness or incapacity, the planning director may approve rental of the restricted unit to a senior, very low income, lower income, or moderate income household.

B. The resale controls will place limits on the resale price of a restricted unit and on the income of the new buyer. The resale price of a restricted unit will be limited to the original price of the restricted unit, plus a factor of appreciation equal to the annual increase in the median income, plus the appraised value, at time of sale, of any documented capital improvements. In addition, when an owner sells a restricted unit, the sale must be to a moderate income household, very low income household, lower income household, or senior household.

C. Resale controls shall be recorded as part of the declaration of covenants, conditions, and restrictions on the restricted unit. The resale controls will remain in effect for the term of affordability.

D. The following transfers of title or any interest therein are not subject to the provisions of this section, provided, however, that the resale controls shall continue to run with the land following such transfers: transfers by gift, devise, or intestate succession to the owner's spouse or children, and transfers of title to a spouse as part of a dissolution of marriage proceeding or in conjunction with marriage.

17. 106.110 - Application procedure.

A. An applicant may submit to the planning director a preliminary proposal for a housing development pursuant to this chapter prior to the submittal of any formal housing development application. The planning director shall, within ninety (90) days of receiving a preliminary proposal, provide the applicant a written preliminary evaluation of the housing development.

B. In addition to the county's usual development requirements, formal application for a housing development under this chapter shall include the following information:

1. A written statement specifying the desired density increase, incentive requested, and the number, type, location, size and construction schedule of all dwelling units;
2. If necessary for the planning director to evaluate the financial need for additional incentives, the applicant shall submit a report that contains housing development costs and revenues, including but not limited to land, construction, and financing costs, and revenues from restricted units, unrestricted units, and density bonus units. Such other information as the planning director needs to evaluate the housing development may be requested by the planning director. The planning director may retain a consultant to review the financial report. The cost of the consultant shall be borne by the applicant; and
3. Any other information requested by the planning director to implement this chapter.

C. Housing developments that meet the requirements set forth in Section 17.106.040 (Density bonus qualifications) above shall qualify for a density bonus and at least one incentive, unless the planning director adopts a written finding that the incentive is not required to achieve the economic feasibility of the restricted units. The planning director may also provide an incentive in place of a density bonus that is of equivalent value to the density bonus. Such incentive shall be calculated in a manner determined by the planning director.

17.106.120 – Density Bonus--Child Care Facilities.

A. When an applicant proposes a housing development that is eligible for a density bonus under this chapter and includes a child care facility on the premises or adjacent to the housing development, the applicant shall receive an additional density bonus that is in an amount of square feet of residential space that is equal to the square footage of the child care facility; or the applicant may receive another incentive that contributes significantly to the economic feasibility of the construction of the child care facility, provided that, in both cases, the following conditions are incorporated in the conditions of approval for the housing development:

1. The child care facility shall remain in operation for a period of time that is as long as or

longer than the period of time during which the restricted units are required to remain affordable pursuant to the terms of the affordable housing agreement executed between the County and the developer.

2. Attendance of children at the child care facility shall have an equal or greater percentage of children from very low, low, and moderate income households than the percentage of affordable units in the housing development.

B. The County may deny the request for a density bonus or incentive for a child care facility if the county finds, based upon substantial evidence, that the community has adequate child care facilities without the facilities being considered as part of the subject housing development.

17.106.130 - Density Bonus--Donation of land.

A. When an applicant for a tentative subdivision map, parcel map or other residential development donates land to the County, the applicant shall be entitled to a density bonus above the maximum allowable residential density, up to a maximum of thirty five (35) percent depending on the amount of land donated. The amount of density bonus shall be based upon the number of permittable units consistent with Section 17.106.050(H). This increase shall be in addition to any increase in density permitted by this chapter up to a maximum combined density increase of 35 percent. A density bonus for donation of land shall only be considered if all of the following conditions are met:

1. The applicant donates and transfers the land no later than the date of approval of the final subdivision map, parcel map, or residential development application.

2. The developable acreage and zoning classification of the land being transferred are sufficient to permit construction of units affordable to very low income households in the amount not less than ten percent (10%) of the residential units in the proposed development.

3. The transferred land is at least one acre in size or of sufficient size to permit development of at least 40 (forty) units, has the appropriate general plan designation, is appropriately zoned for development as affordable housing, and is, or will be, served by adequate public facilities and infrastructure (such as waste water treatment facilities and public transit). The transferred land shall have appropriate zoning and development standards to make the development of the affordable units feasible. No later than the date of approval of the final subdivision map, parcel map, or of the residential development, the transferred land shall have all of the permits and approvals, other than building permits, necessary for the development of the Very Low Income units on the transferred land, except that the County may subject the proposed development to subsequent design review if the design is not reviewed by the County prior to the time of transfer.

4. The transferred land and the units constructed on said land shall be subject to a deed restriction ensuring continued affordability of the units for a period of at least thirty (30) years and subject to restrictions consistent with California Government Code Section 65915 (c)(1) and (2), as may be periodically amended.

5. The land is transferred to the County or to a housing developer approved by the County.

6. The transferred land shall be within the boundary of the proposed development or, if the County determines appropriate, be located within the same General Plan area as the proposed development.

17. 106.140 - Administration and fees.

A. At the discretion of the planning director, the county may contract with another entity to administer the rental and sales provisions of this chapter.

B. The planning director shall establish the amount of fees to be charged to applicants for administration of this chapter at the cost of staff time attributable to such administration. These fees may be waived or reduced as specified in Section 17.106.030 (Definitions) under

subsection (4)(a) of the definition of "incentive" .

C. The planning director shall be responsible for monitoring the resale of restricted units.

D. The planning director shall adopt regulations and forms necessary to implement and interpret the provisions of this chapter.

SECTION XXVII

This ordinance shall take effect and be in force thirty (30) days from and after the date of passage and before the expiration of fifteen (15) days after its passage it shall be published once with the names of the members voting for and against the same in the Inter-City Express, a newspaper published in the County of Alameda.

Adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Alameda, State of California,
_____, 2012 by the following called vote:

AYES:

NOES:

EXCUSED:

NATE MILEY
President of the Board of Supervisors
County of Alameda, State of California

ATTEST: CRYSTAL K. HISHIDA GRAFF,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, County of Alameda

By _____

Approved as to Form:
DONNA ZIEGLER, County Counsel

By _____
BRIAN WASHINGTON
Chief Assistant County Counsel

This page has been intentionally left blank

HOUSING SERVICES AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

The following pages provide information regarding services and programs currently supported by the Alameda County Housing and Community development Department (County HCD).

PERMANENT SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

Permanent Supportive Housing: Permanent affordable housing accompanied by supportive services to assist homeless persons with disabilities to live independently.

Shelter Plus Care Programs

County HCD's Shelter Plus Care (S+C) programs provide on-going rental assistance accompanied by community provided support services to homeless families and individuals disabled by serious mental illness, chronic alcohol and drug problems, and/or HIV and related disorders. Housing components include tenant-based, sponsor-based, and project-based assistance. The program serves over 566 households countywide.

- **S+C Tenant-Based Rental Assistance (TRA):** Once accepted into the program, participants work with designated community based agencies to locate a rental unit in the community. The rental assistance is provided to the landlord and the tenant pays 30% of their income towards rent. The tenant may change housing sites and maintain their rental assistance. County HCD currently assists 410 participants and their families in the TRA component, including 85 in programs linked with three Behavioral Services Mental Health Service Act Full Service Partnerships for chronically homeless adults with serious mental illness.
- **S+C Sponsor-based Rental Assistance (SRA):** Provides housing assistance at designated housing sites owned or managed by nonprofit Sponsors. County HCD's SRA component is comprised of 17 sponsors and currently assists 125 participants, including 59 units at the Harrison Apartments in downtown Oakland and other sites in various cities.
- **S+C Project-based Rental Assistance (PRA):** The Alameda Point Shelter Plus Care PRA Program provides permanent housing and supportive services to 23 formerly homeless individuals with disabilities and their families: 14 at Alameda Point and 9 at the Lorenzo Creek Apartments in Castro Valley.

Supportive Housing Program Projects (SHP) Permanent Housing Programs

HCD's SHP programs provide affordable housing operating subsidies and support services for homeless individuals and families.

- **Lorenzo Creek:** Nine units of permanent supportive housing for homeless people disabled by serious mental illness, chronic alcohol and drug problems, or AIDS and Related Disorders, and their families in an accessible multifamily housing complex constructed using principles of universal design in Castro Valley. Lorenzo Creek residents receive rental subsidies through S+C and supportive services both on and off site through SHP.

- **Spirit of Hope I:** Located at the former Alameda Naval Air Station, Spirit of Hope I provides permanent housing for homeless families with disabilities. Specifically, the project serves large families who were formerly living on the streets or in shelter.
- **Alameda Point Permanent Housing:** APC provides 23 units of permanent housing for homeless families at Alameda Point.
- **Alameda County Impact Program:** The Alameda County Impact Program is a permanent supportive housing program targeting chronically homeless people who have a history of interaction with law enforcement and other emergency systems. The program provides homeless individuals with permanent rental subsidies and supportive services.

TRANSITIONAL HOUSING

Transitional Housing: Housing, where program participants have signed a lease or occupancy agreement, the purpose of which is to facilitate the movement of homeless individuals and families into permanent housing within 24 months or less.

SHP Transitional Housing Programs

HCD's transitional housing programs provide affordable housing and support services to assist homeless individuals and families make the transition to permanent housing.

- **Bessie Coleman Court/Alameda Point Transitional Housing:** Alameda Point Collaborative operates the Bessie Coleman Court/Alameda Point Transitional Housing program, which provides 44 units of transitional housing for homeless families, with units prioritizing victims of domestic violence and families in recovery at Alameda Point.
- **Banyan House Transitional Housing:** The Family Emergency Shelter Coalition, (FESCO) operates a 24 bed transitional housing facility with on-site supportive services for eight families with children per year in the Cherryland district of unincorporated Alameda County. Services are provided and coordinated by FESCO.

HOMELESS EMERGENCY SHELTER

Homeless Shelter: Safe temporary housing that provides an opportunity to connect with housing service providers to develop a plan for regaining permanent housing.

- **Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG):** County HCD's annual ESG grant provides funds for staffing and support services in emergency shelters serving the five small cities and the unincorporated county (the "Urban County"). Funds available are approximately \$100,000 annually and are spread between emergency shelter and rapid re-housing programs.

- **Winter Shelter/Winter Relief:** County HCD provides annual funding for cold weather winter relief in North County in partnership with the cities of Oakland, Berkeley, Emeryville and Albany, and in South County in partnership with the City of Fremont through a contract with Abode Services. In FY14/15, the Winter Shelter/Winter Relief program includes outreach efforts, warming centers, limited additional shelter beds and a small expansion of rapid re-housing resources.

RAPID RE-HOUSING PROGRAMS

Rapid Re-housing: Provides move-in assistance, short-term rental subsidies, and connection to support services to quickly transition homeless households to a permanent housing solution. Rapid Re-housing programs assist clients by identifying barriers to housing stability and linking them with services to address those barriers while the household is permanently housed.

- **Southern Alameda County Housing/Jobs Linkages Program:** This 7-agency collaborative program, led by Alameda County Housing and Community Development, provides transitional housing subsidies on permanent housing units, job preparation and placement, case management and other support services to homeless families throughout Mid, South and Eastern Alameda County. The program serves approximately 47 families at a time. Partners include Abode Services, FESCO, ESP, Building Futures with Women and Children, SAVE, and Tri-Valley Haven.
- **Realignment Housing Program:** In partnership with Alameda County's Probation Department, Social Services Agency, and three community-based organizations, County HCD's Realignment Housing Program provides a range of supports to people on Probation supervision under Criminal Justice Realignment. The goal of the Program is to assist participants to secure long-term stable housing that they can afford to retain. The program also provides immediate assistance to participants who are homeless or at risk. Services include: housing case management, emergency shelter or transitional program settings if needed, assistance securing long-term housing and short-term rental assistance, if needed. Flexibility allows responsiveness to the needs of participants. Referrals to the Program are made by Probation Deputies.
- **Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG):** County HCD currently funds community-based organizations to provide rapid re-housing services to the "Urban County" (Berkeley Food and Housing Project, Family Emergency Shelter Coalition and Abode Services). Services are provided to the cities of Albany, Emeryville, Dublin, Newark, Piedmont and the unincorporated county and are expected to serve approximately 48 households over two years.
- **Winter Relief:** County HCD funds a rapid re-housing program in conjunction with the North County Winter Shelter program and in place of a previous South County Winter relief program.
- **CalWORKs Housing Support (HSP):** County HCD, in partnership with Social Services Agency, funds a rapid re-housing program for homeless CalWORKs families.

HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Homelessness Prevention: Provides short term, targeted assistance to households at-risk of losing their permanent housing. Provides a broad spectrum of financial assistance to re-stabilize the household until the crisis is resolved. Provides connections to other mainstream resources to maintain stability.

- **Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG):** County HCD partners with Berkeley Food and Housing Project for services in Albany, Emeryville and Piedmont, and Family Emergency Shelter Coalition for services in the Unincorporated County, Newark, and Dublin, to identify and stabilize households at risk of losing their permanent housing.

SUPPORT SERVICES ONLY

Projects that offer supportive services to address the special needs of participants, such as child care, employment assistance, and transportation services, often in conjunction with permanent housing, although these programs do not directly include housing.

- **APC Multi-Service Center:** The Alameda Point Support Services and Employment Project provides case management, employment training and placement, and comprehensive supportive services to more than 600 formerly homeless adults and children living at the former Alameda Naval Air Station. This project is specifically for current APC residents.
- **Reciprocal Integrated Services for Empowerment (RISE) Project:** County HCD is the lead agency of a five agency collaborative that serves S+C tenants with a range of integrated supportive services focused on assisting participants with maintaining permanent housing. RISE serves over 155 participants and their families annually, and conducts home visits throughout Alameda County.

Profiles of partner agencies and programs that serve Unincorporated Alameda County residents

The Davis Street Family Resource Center: The Resource Center provides emergency food, clothing, subsidized child-care, free acute medical and dental care, mental health counseling, crisis intervention, case management, and many other support services to low-income residents.

Eden Information and Referral: Eden Information and Referral provides the 2-1-1 telephone services, which provides free access to health, housing, and human services information and referral. Eden Council for Hope & Opportunity (ECHO) provides Fair Housing counseling and investigation services. ECHO also works with landlords and tenants on housing rights and responsibilities to prevent evictions.

The Safe Alternatives to Violent Environments (SAVE) Program: The SAVE program provides crisis intervention services in collaboration with law enforcement. SAVE provides services to homeless, low-income survivors of domestic violence and their children. Resources include affordable housing, emergency sheltering, counseling services, clothing, transportation, and assistance in obtaining retraining and protection orders, among many other services.

Family Emergency Shelter Coalition (FESCO): The Family Emergency Shelter Coalition provides shelter and support services to approximately 60 homeless families, including children, each year. Services include intake, stabilization, a family needs assessment, and case management.

Women on the Way: A 10-bed shelter that provides drug and alcohol recovery treatment, counseling, and other support services to women to help them transition into more stable housing.

Seventh Step Foundation: Provides housing for 32 adult male parolees from the California Correctional System returning to the community.

Spectrum Community Services: Spectrum provides home-delivered meals and nutrition services for low-income individuals and families.

Community Resources for Independent Living (CRIL): CRIL provides individuals with disabilities support so that they can live independently within the community.

Hope 4 the Heart: Hope 4 the Heart provides food, produce, diapers, and household items to local families who are experiencing food insecurity.

Building Opportunities for Self Sufficiency (BOSS): BOSS assists homeless, low-income, and disabled people with housing and supportive services. BOSS provides S+C programs, transitional housing, and permanent supportive housing to area residents.

Abode Services: Abode Services provides transitional housing, homelessness prevention, permanent supportive housing to Alameda County residents.



Date: January 17, 2014
TO: Alameda County CoC NOFA Applicants
From: HUD NOFA Committee / EveryOne Home
Subject: **Project Priority List for Submission to HUD and Your Project Score(s)**

Thank you for your submission to the 2014 HUD Continuum of Care Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) local process. The NOFA Committee has completed its review work and established the project list to be submitted to HUD. On the following page you will find the list of all projects being included in the application package indicating both the order and where the HUD-established Tier Line falls. Column 1 shows the rank order of projects as it will be submitted to HUD. As a separate attachment, you will find your project(s)'s total score and the sub-score for each section.

As you know, this was a challenging year; the community entered into this NOFA process fully aware of the requirement to place a minimum of 5% (\$1,241,038) of its renewal demand amount in Tier 2, with the likelihood of losing those funds. HUD further stated that if funds were available after all Tier 1 projects were funded, projects in Tier 2 would be considered in priority order as follows: 1. renewing PSH; 2. new PSH; 3. new rapid rehousing; 4. renewing TH; 5. CoC planning; 6. UFA costs; 7. coordinated assessment; 8. renewing HMIS; and 9. renewing SSO. Projects in each priority would be funded starting with the highest scoring continuum nationally until all funds were expended or all continuums reviewed before starting on the next priority.

With these parameters in mind, the NOFA committee strove to score applications fairly, and with greatest reduction of impact to homeless people in the County. It also determined that any SSO and TH projects whose scores put them below the Tier 1 funding line would be reallocated to new Permanent Housing Projects. Two SSO projects' scores placed them below the funding line, one fully and the other partially. Those amounts have been reallocated. One project will not be included in the submission to HUD and the other will be included in a reduced amount. Two new projects were selected to be included in Tier 2. They are listed as well. HUD has made it clear that all projects included in a community's Tier 1 that pass the HUD-established thresholds can expect to be refunded. (The HUD thresholds are similar to those in previous years; no local project has ever been defunded by HUD in the application process.) Tier 2 projects will be funded nationally in an order based on the score of the community's application.

This memo and attachments are being sent to the direct grantee only. We encourage you to forward the Project Priority List and any relevant to scoring information to your project partners. If you are the lead agency on multiple projects, all scores will be listed in the same attachment, but in their own individual tables. The Project Priority List will be posted to the website this afternoon, and the full CoC Application will be posted to the website prior to the February 3, 2014 deadline.

If you have questions or comments, please email everyonehome@acgov.org. The EveryOne Home offices will be closed in observance of the Martin Luther King Jr. holiday, therefore questions and comments will be addressed beginning January 21st through January 24th. Since HUD has made clear that all projects included in a community's Tier 1 can expect to be refunded, there will be no adjustments to any scores for those projects currently ranked in Tier 1, and detailed reviews of scoring will be deferred until after the NOFA submission.

A debriefing session of the 2013 NOFA process will be held in early to mid-March, at which time the community will be invited to provide comments and feedback about the NOFA process and results. A notification email will be sent out closer to that date, with all pertinent information.

Thank you again for your work. Please continue to be attentive to emails from EveryOne Home and HCD as we move to complete our application to HUD.

Alameda County 2013 Continuum of Care NOFA Process
Project Rating and Ranking List

Rank	Project	Agency	Program
TIER 1			
1	InHOUSE	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	HMIS
2	COACH Project	City of Berkeley	PSH
3	AC Impact	Abode Services	PSH
4	Oakland Path Rehousing Initiative (OPRI)- SHP	Abode Services	PSH
5	HOPE Housing	County of Alameda	PSH
6	Supportive Housing Network	City of Berkeley	PSH
7	Concord House	Resources for Community Development	PSH
8	Russell Street Residence (RSR)	Berkeley Food and Housing Project	PH-RRH
9	Regent Street	Resources for Community Development	PSH
10	Southern Alameda County Housing/Jobs Linkages	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
11	Lorenzo Creek S+C	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
12	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - HOST	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
13	Spirit of Hope 1	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
14	Shelter Plus Care Tenant Based Rental Assistance	City of Berkeley	PSH
15	Housing Fast Support Network	City of Oakland	TH
16	Lorenzo Creek SHP	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
17	STAY Well Housing	Abode Services	PSH
18	Tri-City/FESCO Bridgeway Apartments	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
19	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - PRA	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
20	Peter Babcock House	Affordable Housing Associates	PSH
21	Alameda Point Permanent	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
22	APC Multi Service Center	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	SSO - PH
23	Bessie Coleman Court/Alameda Point Transitional	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	TH
24	Pathways Project	City of Berkeley	PSH
25	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRO	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
26	Channing Way Apartments	Bonita House, Inc.	PSH
27	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - SRA	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
28	Health, Housing and Integrated Services Network	LifeLong Medical Care	SSO - PH
29	Turning Point FY11	Fred Finch Youth Center	TH
30	Bridget Transitional House	Women's Daytime Drop-In Center	TH
31	NCWC- North County Women's Center	Berkeley Food and Housing Project	TH
32	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care - FACT	County of Alameda	PSH
33	Harrison House Family Services Program	Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency	TH
34	Ashby House	Operation Dignity, Inc.	TH
35	Rubicon Berkeley Employment Services	Rubicon Programs Inc.	SSO
36	Matilda Cleveland Transitional Housing Program	City of Oakland	TH
37	Alameda County Shelter Plus Care Program - TRA	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
38	Housing Stabilization	Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency	TH
39	Homeless Outreach for People Empowerment	City of Fremont	SSO
40	Families in Transition Scattered Sites	City of Oakland	TH
41	Walker House	Yvette A. Flunder Foundation	PSH
42	Oakland Homeless Youth Housing Collaborative	City of Oakland	TH
43	South County Sober Housing	Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency	TH
44	Banyan House Transitional Housing	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	TH
45	McKinley Family Transitional House	Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency	TH
46	Reciprocal Integrated Services for Empowerment	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	SSO-PH
47	Rosa Parks House	Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency	TH
48	Self-Sufficiency Project	Building Opportunities for Self-Sufficiency	SSO
TIER 2			
49	Welcome Home	Alameda County Housing and Community Development	PSH
50	North County Family Rapid Rehousing	City of Oakland	PH-RRH