

- **Air Quality mitigation fee:** \$325.84 per daily vehicle trip end (DVTE) for single-family dwellings only; and
- **Construction inspection fee:** approximately \$1,500.

Together, TRPA mitigation fees for a 2,000 square foot single-family home would cost an estimated \$7,500.

## **Traffic Mitigation Fees**

In 1996, Placer County adopted the Countywide Traffic Impact Fee Program, which requires new development within the unincorporated areas of the county to mitigate impacts to the roadway system by paying impact fees. The fees collected through this program are used to construct the roads and other transportation improvements that are needed to accommodate new development. The program divides the county into eleven benefit districts, and the fees collected within each district are applied only to roadway improvements within the particular benefit district (see Table 65).

TABLE 65 TRAFFIC MITIGATION FEES BY BENEFIT DISTRICT Placer County 2012						
Benefit District	County Fee per DUE <sup>1</sup>	Highway 65 Fee per DUE	SPRTA Regional Fee per DUE	PC/CR Fee Per DUE	Total Fee per DUE	
Auburn	\$4,705	-	-	-	\$4,705	
Dry Creek	\$3,362	-	\$667	\$861	\$4,890	
Foresthill	\$4,425	-	-	-	\$4,425	
Granite Bay	\$5,928	-	\$848	\$57	\$6,833	
Meadow Vista	\$4,863	ı	-	-	\$4,863	
Newcastle/Horseshoe Bar/Penryn	\$4,634	_	\$1,398	\$37	\$6,069	
Placer Central	\$1,995	-	\$1,834	\$43	\$3,872	
Placer East	\$3,227	-	-	-	\$3,227	
Placer West	\$2,471	-	\$1,864	\$91	\$4,426	
Sunset	\$1,600 per 1000 sq.ft. of land use	\$2,091	\$1,429	\$233	varies	
Tahoe	\$4,587	\$2,091	\$1,429	\$433	\$4,587	
Natari DUE - Develling		DIE.		-		

Notes: <sup>1</sup> DUE = Dwelling Unit Equivalent. DUE is a term used to compare the vehicular traffic generated by different land uses to that of a single-family residential unit. The DUE factor for each land use category takes into account the number of trips made within the afternoon peak hour, the average length of each trip in miles, and the percentage of new trips resulting from that land use. The DUE for a single-family unit would be equal to one since it is the standard. Non-residential uses are typically expressed in terms of DUEs per 1,000 square feet. For example, a 2,000 square foot office building would have a DUE of about 7.9 times that of a single-family unit.

County fees effective 8/1/2009; SPRTA fees effective 10/1/2010; Hwy 65 JPA fees effective 7/5/2011 Source: Placer County Department of Public Works, 2012



## **Typical Residential Development Fees**

Table 66 summarizes the typical fees that would apply to a typical single-family residence and multi-family unit in Placer County. Together these development fees cost approximately \$41,788 for a typical, 1,500 square foot single-family home, and \$29,688 for an 800-square-foot multi-family unit.

TABLE 66 TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT FEES Placer County 2012							
Type of Fee	Single-Family	Multi-Family					
Sewer Hook-up Fee	\$8,179	\$5,839					
School Fee	\$2-\$5/sq. ft.	\$2-\$5/sq. ft.					
	\$5,250 avg. based on	\$2,400 avg. based on					
	1500 sq. ft. residence	800 sq. ft. unit					
Building Permit Fee	\$2,361 based on 1500	\$1,461based on 800 sq.					
	sq. ft. residence	ft. unit					
County Traffic Fee	Low: \$3,227	Low: \$1,981,					
	High: \$6,833	High: \$4,195					
Fire Fee	\$.68/sq. ft.	\$.68/sq. ft.					
	\$1,020 based on 1500	\$544based on 800 sq.					
	sq. ft. residence	ft. unit					
Facility Fee	\$33,683	\$2,684					
Park Fee	\$4,105	\$2,990					
Water (PCWA)- base	Low: \$9,927	Low: \$6,949					
connection	High: \$14,414	High: \$14,414					
TOTAL AVERAGE COST	\$41,788	\$29,688					

Source: Placer County Fee Schedule, Placer County Fire Districts, PCWA

# 7. On/Off-Site Improvement Requirements

Placer County requires the installation of certain on-site and off-site improvements to ensure the safety and livability of its residential neighborhoods. On-site improvements typically include street, curb, gutter, sidewalk, and utilities as well as amenities such as landscaping, fencing, streetlights, open space, and park facilities. Off-site improvements typically include the following:

- Road improvements, including construction of sections of roadway, medians, bridges, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, and lighting;
- Drainage improvements, including improvement to sections of channel, culverts, swales, and pond areas;
- Sewage collection and treatment;
- Water systems improvements, including lines, storage tanks, and treatment plants. Public facilities for fire, school, and recreation; and



Geological hazard repair and maintenance where appropriate.

Typically, on-site and off-site improvement costs associated with residential projects are passed on to the homebuyer as part of the final cost of the home.

## **Parking**

#### Overview

Since off-street parking often requires large amounts of land, parking requirements are one of the development standards that can most negatively impact the development of affordable housing. Off-street parking requirements increase the cost of development, limiting the funds available for providing housing. Parking standards in most jurisdictions have been arbitrarily established and do not necessarily represent the needs of the people living in the developments. This is especially true for senior and affordable housing developments where occupants are less likely to require more than one parking space.

The cost of land associated with parking, in addition to the costs of construction, paving, and maintenance, drive up the overall cost of development, reducing funds available for the development of affordable housing.

Placer County's off street parking standards for residential uses as required by Zoning Ordinance Section 17.54.060 are as follows:

- Single family dwellings: two spaces per dwelling unit
- Two-family dwellings and townhouse units: two spaces per dwelling unit
- Multiple-family dwellings:
  - Studio and One-Bedroom: one space per dwelling unit plus one guest space for each 4 dwelling units
  - Two-Bedroom or larger: two spaces per dwelling unit plus one guest space for each 4 dwelling units
- Senior housing: One and a half spaces for each dwelling unit
- Second unit dwellings:
  - 640 sq. ft. or less—one space (Lake Tahoe Basin: 840 sq. ft. or less)
  - More than 640 square feet–two spaces

The Placer County Zoning Ordinance requires parking spaces to be a minimum of 9 feet in width and 20 feet in depth. Including access lanes and landscaping requirements, the average parking space in a large parking lot requires 300 to 350 square feet of land.

The County has produced a draft ordinance that would establish an in-lieu parking fee program for the North Tahoe Parking Districts. Developers proposing projects within the Parking Districts



could choose to pay a fee in place of providing off-street parking. As of January 1, 2007, the inlieu of fee was \$16,350 per parking space.

In the Kings Beach, Tahoe Vista, Tahoe City and West Shore areas in the Tahoe Basin, shared parking is permitted. Shared parking facilities may be approved if two or more users/applicants execute and record reciprocal agreements for shard parking if and when the uses have different peak periods and parking demand will not overlap.

If requested by the applicant, Placer County grants parking reductions to affordable housing developers. The reductions are consistent with the Statewide Parking Standards for Affordable Housing (see Density Bonus), and can significantly reduce the costs associated with parking.

Placer County Zoning Code allows for administrative relief from the zoning code standards for infill and/or affordable housing projects. Up to a ten percent reduction in the parking standards is allowed provided that the required amount of parking is unreasonable given the type of development.

#### **Conclusions**

Placer County's parking standards are similar to those in other jurisdictions, and therefore do not represent a development constraint above-and-beyond that of other counties. Additionally, the County offers reduced parking standards as an incentive for affordable housing developers.

#### Streets

#### <u>Overview</u>

The County does not require street improvements for single-family dwellings, but does require street improvements for new development in the following zoned areas: R-2, R-3, C-1, C-2, C-1 and 2, C-3, C-4, M, M-P, S-C, APT and HS (these zones do not correspond to the zones listed in the zoning ordinance).

The standard required improvements for new developments and new phases of established developments are as follows:

- Road widening on the project's frontage to one-half the total amount indicated in the Land Use/Circulation Diagrams and Standards found in the General Plan;
- Construction of up to one lane of road widening plus shoulders or on-street parking, except where additional widening for tapers, driveways, transitions or turning lanes are associated with the project in which case such additional widening may also be required;
- Street lighting may be required in major commercial areas; and
- Concrete curb, gutter and sidewalk are required in urban areas and may be required for any development.



#### Conclusions

Site improvements in the county consist of those typically associated with development for onsite improvements (fronting streets, curbs, gutters, sewer/water, and sidewalks), and off-site improvements (drainage, parks, traffic, schools, and sewer/water). Therefore, these are costs that will be added to the sale or rental price of housing. Because residential development cannot take place without the addition of adequate infrastructure, site improvement requirements are not a constraint to the development of housing within Placer County.

#### Other

Typical off-site improvements for both single family and multifamily developments might include: recreational trail facilities, traffic control needed to serve the development, street trees, and landscaping. Utilities may need to be upgraded or installed to serve the development, including water mains, sewer mains, storm water pollution prevention measures, and under grounding of electric utilities.

## **Summary Conclusion**

The requirements for on- and off-site improvements are similar to those of many other communities across California, and as such do not represent an undue constraint on the development of affordable housing. Placer County does provide some flexibility in standards for affordable housing projects.

# 8. Open Space and Park Requirements

#### Overview

Open space and park requirements can decrease the affordability of housing by decreasing the amount of land available on a proposed site for constructing units. The Land Use Element requires that open space be included within certain new developments as identified in the General Plan. Policy 1.B.9 states that the County shall require all residential development to provide private or public open space.

The County requires new development to provide a minimum of 5 acres of improved parkland and 5 acres of passive recreation area or open space for every 1,000 new residents of the area covered by the development. Applicants may meet the requirement through the dedication of land and/or payment of fees, in accordance with State law (Quimby Act) to ensure funding for the acquisition and development of public recreation facilities.

To fund the acquisition and maintenance of County parks and open space, the County charges a park fee to all development projects. The park fee is currently (2012) \$4,105 per single-family dwelling; \$2,990 per multi-family dwelling, second unit dwelling, or mobile home; \$2,710 per senior dwelling; and \$650 per subdivided lot.

The fees are set and adjusted as necessary to provide for a level of funding that meets the actual cost to provide for all of the public parkland and park development needs generated by new development.



#### Conclusions

The requirements for open space and park facilities are similar to those of many other communities across California, and as such do not represent an undue constraint on the development of affordable housing. Placer County does provide some flexibility in standards for affordable housing projects.

# 9. Inclusionary Housing

#### Overview

The only inclusionary requirements in the county apply to Specific Plan projects. There are no inclusionary requirements in the unincorporated county. The Placer County Planning Commission recently (2007) rejected a proposed countywide inclusionary zoning ordinance. The County is not likely to adopt such an ordinance within the next eight years. Roseville is the only city in the county with an inclusionary ordinance.

#### Conclusions

Placer County's inclusionary housing requirements within Specific Plan project areas do not represent an undue constraint on the development of affordable housing and are responsible for the provision of more affordable housing than would otherwise be built.

# 10. Density Bonus

#### Overview

A density bonus is the allocation of development rights that allows a parcel to accommodate additional square footage or additional residential units beyond the maximum for which the parcel is zoned. On January 1, 2005, SB 1818 (Chapter 928, Statutes of 2004) revised California's density bonus law (Government Code 65915) by reducing the number of affordable units that a developer must provide in order to receive a density bonus. The legislation also increased the maximum density bonus to 35 percent. The minimum affordability requirements are as follows:

- The project is eligible for a 20 percent density bonus if at least 5 percent of the units are affordable to very low-income households, or 10 percent of the units are affordable to low-income households; and
- The project is eligible to receive a 5 percent density bonus if 10 percent of for purchase units are affordable to moderate-income households.

The law also established a sliding scale, which determines the additional density that a project can receive. A developer can receive the maximum density bonus of 35 percent when the project provides either 11 percent very low-income units, 20 percent low-income units, or 40 percent moderate-income units. In 2005, SB 435 was passed. This legislation served to clarify California's density bonus law by explaining that a project can only receive one density bonus.

Prior to SB 1818 and SB 435, jurisdictions were required to grant one incentive, such as financial assistance or development standard reductions, to developers of affordable housing. The new



laws require that cities and counties grant more incentives depending on the percentage of affordable units developed. Incentives include reductions in zoning standards, reductions in development standards, reductions in design requirements, and other reductions in costs for developers. Projects that satisfy the minimum affordable criteria for a density bonus are entitled to one incentive from the local government. Depending on the amount of affordable housing provided, the number of incentives can increase to a maximum of three incentives from the local government. If a project provides affordable units but uses less than 50 percent of the permitted density bonus, the local government is required to provide an additional incentive.

Additionally, the new laws provide density bonuses to projects that donate land for residential use. The donated land must satisfy all of the following requirements:

- The land must have general plan and zoning designations which allow the construction of very low-income affordable units as a minimum of 10 percent of the units in the residential development;
- The land must be a minimum of 1 acre in size or large enough to allow development of at least 40 units; and
- The land must be served by public facilities and infrastructure.

SB 1818 also imposes statewide parking standards that a jurisdiction must grant upon request from a developer of an affordable housing project that qualifies for a density bonus. When local parking requirements are higher, the statewide parking standards supersede the local requirements. The developer may request these parking standards even if they do not request the density bonus. The new parking standards are summarized in Table 67 below. These numbers are the total number of parking spaces including guest parking and handicapped parking.

Statewide Parki Affordae Cali	TABLE 67 STATEWIDE PARKING STANDARDS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING California 2007				
Number of Number of On-Site Bedrooms Parking Spaces					
0 to 1 bedroom	1				
2 to 3 bedrooms	2				
4 or more bedrooms	2 ½				

Source: Goldfarb & Lipman, LLC., SB 1818 Q & A

Placer County Code Section 17.54.120 is consistent with State law requirements related to density bonus. The County offers a 20 percent density bonus to developers that provide either: 1) at least 10 percent of units for low-income households; or 2) at least 5 percent of units for very low-income households. The County also offers a 5 percent density bonus to developers of a condominium project or planned unit development with at least 10 percent of units reserved as affordable to moderate-income households. The developer can decide to increase the percentage of affordable or senior units to receive a maximum 35 percent density bonus. Additionally, the



County offers affordable housing developers up to three density bonus incentives as required by State law. The County also offers density bonuses to projects that donate land for affordable housing and offers parking ratio reductions consistent with the statewide parking standards shown in Table 56

Placer County's Code Section 17.56.210 states that the County offers a 25 percent density bonus for housing projects that reserve at least 50 percent of residential units for senior households. A project is granted additional density bonuses based on certain criteria including, but not limited to, affordability of units, meals served, distance to shopping centers and distance to transportation services. A senior project can acquire a maximum 250 percent density bonus depending on the criteria that it meets.

#### Conclusions

Placer County's treatment of the density bonus provision does not represent a constraint on the production of affordable housing. The County's density bonus ordinance is consistent with State law and promotes affordable housing by offering an incentive to developers who produce units affordable to seniors, very low-, and low-income households.

## 11. State of California, Article 34

#### Overview

Article 34 of the State Constitution requires voter approval for specified "low rent" housing projects that involve certain types of public agency participation. Generally, a project is subject to Article 34 if more than 49 percent of its units will be rented to low-income persons. If a project is subject to Article 34, it will require an approval from the local electorate. This can constrain the production of affordable housing, since the process to seek ballot approval for affordable housing projects can be costly and time consuming, with no guarantee of success.

The provisions of Article 34 allow local jurisdictions to seek voter approval for "general authority" to develop low-income housing without identifying specific projects or sites. If the electorate approves general parameters for certain types of affordable housing development, the local jurisdiction will be able to move more quickly in response to housing opportunities that fall within those parameters.

Placer County has not built housing itself (it has only provided financial assistance to affordable housing projects), so it has not needed Article 34 authorization. Most affordable housing projects are built by private developers, who seek financial assistance from the State and Federal governments.

#### Conclusions

The lack of Article 34 authorization has not served as a constraint to the development of affordable housing.



# 12. Development, Maintenance, and Improvement of Housing for Persons with Disabilities

#### Overview

In accordance with SB 520 (Chapter 671, Statutes of 2001), the County has analyzed the potential and actual governmental constraints on the development of housing for persons with disabilities (see Responses to SB 520 Analysis Questions in Appendix A). On an ongoing basis, the County reviews its zoning laws, policies, and practices to ensure compliance with fair housing laws. Placer County has adopted the 2010 California Building Code, including Title 24 regulations of the code concerning accessibility for persons with disabilities. The County has not adopted any additional universal design elements in its building code beyond Title 24 requirements.

In 2008, Placer County adopted Section 17.56.185 into the Zoning Ordinance to establish a formal procedure for persons with disabilities, seeking equal access to housing, to request reasonable accommodation in the application of the County's land use regulations. Persons with disabilities can request reasonable accommodation by submitting an application, which is reviewed by the Planning Director. If the request is made in conjunction with another discretionary approval, such as a use permit, the request is submitted and reviewed concurrently with the application for the discretionary approval. There is no application fee associated with the request for reasonable accommodation.

#### Conclusions

The reasonable accommodation ordinance allows certain deviations from development standards to accommodate accessibility improvements in existing structures. The ordinance demonstrates the County's efforts to remove governmental constraints to meeting the need for housing for persons with disabilities.

# 13. Impediments to Affordable Housing Production in the Tahoe Region

## Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA)

The Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) was established in 1969 as a Bi-State Compact between California and Nevada and later approved by Congress to oversee development and protect the natural resources of the Tahoe Basin. TRPA's mission is to preserve, restore, and enhance the natural and human environment in the Lake Tahoe basin. The Agency's Regional Plan is the long-term plan for the development of the Lake Tahoe region. In some cases, regulations that further the realization of TRPA's Regional Plan can preempt California and Nevada state law.

TRPA's Code of Ordinances establishes specific regulations and thresholds for, among other things, land use, density, rate of growth, land coverage, excavation, and scenic impacts. These regulations are designed to bring the Tahoe regions into conformance with the threshold standards established for water quality, air quality, soil conservation, wildlife habitat, vegetation, noise, recreation, and scenic resources. However, while these regulations serve to protect and



enhance the Tahoe Basin, they create additional costs and requirements that can constrain development and housing production despite the great need for such housing. TRPA employs some measures to promote affordable housing in the Basin, many of the environmental regulations limit the feasibility of affordable housing projects for lower-income and moderate-income residents.

TRPA is currently (2012) working to update its Regional Plan which is expected to go before the TRPA Board for approval in December 2012. Providing a variety of housing choices around the basin has been identified as a top priority. The current TRPA regulations will be changing when the update is adopted and implemented. Given the need for regulatory consistency between the TRPA RPU and the County's Community Plan, staff has been providing regular feedback and proposing modifications to the Regional Plan Update to address areas of inconsistency related to land use/zoning district designations and development standards.

Placer County also has a strong interest in permitting secondary units on parcels less than one acre in size within the Tahoe Basin. The County is working with TRPA to certify its local government housing program before entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the County and TRPA to allow secondary units on parcels smaller than one acre. Those secondary dwelling units would be deed restricted units as is allowed in the city of South Lake Tahoe. Consideration of the County's request is expected after TRPA adopts in Regional Plan.

#### Zoning

#### Overview

Under the previous Regional Plan, Plan Area Statements and Community Plans are the equivalents of a general plan land use designations and zoning districts in TRPA regulations. Each parcel of land within the region was assigned to a Plan Area Statement (PAS) or Community Plan (CP) district. Each of these documents defined the "permissible uses" for the given area. The PAS used "flexible zoning" that often allows a variety of residential uses without requiring rezoning. There are currently 54 PAS and CP areas in the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County (see Appendix B, Plan Area Statements and Permissible Residential Uses for Tahoe Basin Portion of Placer County).

Placer County is currently updating its Tahoe Basin Community Plans to be consistent with the upcoming Regional Plan. Community Plans replace the Plan Area Statements for the areas within the community plan boundaries, but are required to retain certain features of the plan area statements as set forth in the Regional Plan.

In Placer County, all PAS districts are being replaced with Transect Zone Districts. One of the goals of the Regional Plan Update is to create a more efficient planning system that integrated TRPA requirements into the plans and permits of other government agencies.

Staff has reviewed and considered the RPU policies as they relate to the County's land use planning policy efforts in the Basin. To further ensure consistency between the RPU and the Community Plan Update, staff will work to incorporate RPU policies into the development of the Community Plan policy document where necessary.



TRPAs draft policies create incentives for restoration of sensitive lands and increases the feasibility of "environmental redevelopment." The RPU proposes to eliminate regulatory barriers to redevelopment of rundown buildings. Current protective policies on land coverage, height, density, combined with the cap of development rights make redevelopment projects infeasible. TRPA is proposing to allow Community Plans that demonstrate environmental improvement to increase building height and density.

#### Conclusions

TRPA's current PAS system of land use designations and zoning does not serve as a constraint to affordable housing in the Tahoe Basin. The flexible zoning mechanism provides for a wide range of permissible uses.

TRPA's RPU vision is for an improved planning and permitting system where all requirements are addressed in coordinated area plans.

#### Land Coverage Limitations

#### Overview

Paved areas like roads, parking lots and building (i.e., impervious surfaces) negatively impact water quality in Lake Tahoe. TRPA created rules for land coverage because of the link to the lake's world-famous clarity.

There are two systems that regulate land coverage in the Lake Tahoe Basin. The Bailey Land Capability Classification System, in place since 1971, regulates land coverage for all uses except single-family housing development. Single-family housing falls under the Individual Parcel Evaluation System (IPES), which was adopted by TRPA under the 1987 Regional Plan.

The Bailey classification system uses a land development capability scoring system that ranges from 1 to 7. Low-capability scores (less suitable for development) range between 1 and 3, and high-capability scores (more suitable for development) range between 4 and 7. The IPES system, used only for vacant residential parcels, uses a land development capability scoring system that ranges between 0 and 1,200, with scores under 726 considered low-capability and above 726 considered high-capability. Landowners are permitted to cover between 1 percent and 30 percent of a parcel's surface with "base coverage" (structures and parking), depending on the Bailey classification or IPES score.

In addition to the "base coverage", owners can transfer additional units of land coverage up to a specific maximum based upon the parcel size. This transferred land coverage is purchased either privately or from a land bank in accordance with hydrologic transfer area restrictions. These rules enable coverage to be moved around within a sub watershed, but remain within the cap that was created to protect Lake Tahoe.

In a 1987 Settlement Agreement, TRPA agreed to lover the IPES line from 726 to 1 subject to a number of environmental "safeguards." These safeguards include requirements to install a water quality monitoring program and retirement of environmentally-sensitive parcels. Currently (2008), every jurisdiction in the Tahoe Basin, with the exception of Placer County, has had its



IPES line reduced to 1. The stagnation of the IPES line at 726 in Placer County limits the land available for residential development.

TRPA's current land coverage system has made redevelopment of many older properties cost prohibitive. The RPU is proposing an evolution of land coverage regulations to promote the redevelopment of older buildings and improvements to lake clarity. TRPA is proposing to encourage land coverage be relocated to town centers, where greater density, walkability and links to transit are planned. TRPA would also allow excess coverage to be removed and converted to development rights and also allow coverage to be regulated at a neighborhood scale, rather than parcel-by-parcel, if overall coverage and coverage on sensitive lands is reduced.

#### **Conclusions**

Land coverage limitations often pose a constraint to the achievement of maximum residential density for multi-family uses but proposed changes in the RPU will help facilitate higher-density development in the basin. The stagnation of the IPES line at 726 limits the land available for residential development and is a constraint on the production of housing in the Tahoe Basin portion of the county.

## **Density Limitations**

#### <u>Overview</u>

The maximum permissible density for multi-family housing in the Tahoe Basin is currently 15 units per acre. Affordable housing is allowed a 25 percent density bonus (which would allow up to 18.75 units per acre) when the following two specific findings can be made: 1) the project, at the increased density, satisfies a demonstrated need for additional affordable housing; and 2) the additional density is consistent with the surrounding area., Maximum densities are generally not achievable due to other site constraints which limit land coverage availability but may be more achievable with proposed changed to the RPU. Placer County is expected to propose higher densities in its Community Plan Update though this would require an amendment to the RPU in order to be implemented.

#### **Conclusions**

Density limits can be a constraint to the production of affordable housing in the Tahoe Basin. Developers of affordable housing often require higher densities to make a project financially feasible. Although density bonuses are available to some affordable housing developments, maximum densities are often not achievable due to other site limitations such as land coverage limitations, height restrictions, and setbacks.

#### Affordable Housing Incentives

#### Overview

TRPA has various provisions to reduce the regulations for affordable housing projects. To encourage the development of moderate-income housing, TRPA has developed a Moderate-Income Housing Program, which local jurisdictions must develop in collaboration with TRPA.



In April 2004, the TRPA amended its Regional Plan in an effort to encourage the development of moderate-income housing units in the Tahoe Basin. The TRPA amendments stipulate that multi-residential bonus units be made available to moderate-income housing projects that are designed as transit oriented developments. Additionally, to qualify, local jurisdictions must deed restrict eligible moderate-income units in perpetuity.

On July 27, 2005 the TRPA Governing Board certified the Moderate Income Housing Program Plan submitted by the former Redevelopment Agency. The adopted plan allows the County to provide an incentive to developers to create moderate-income (80 percent of the county median income) and very low income (50 percent of the county median income) housing projects in the Tahoe Basin. This program qualifies moderate-income projects for "bonus units" which are equivalent to an allocation and which would otherwise need to be purchased on the market or transferred from another project. New, affordable low and very-low income housing units are exempt from development allocations.

#### Conclusions

While TRPA regulations create constraints on the production of housing, low-income housing projects have fewer, yet still significant, restrictions. Regulations on moderate-income housing are more restrictive. TRPA also has various provisions to promote the production of moderate-income housing units. Placer County does not have any authority to change the TRPA regulatory environment but can work with TRPA to implement changes to remove barriers to production of affordable housing in the basin.

## 14. Local Efforts to Remove Barriers

Placer County continues to work with TRPA to modify policies that are negatively impacting the creation of affordable housing such as restrictions on the construction of secondary dwelling units. County staff will also continue to be involved in the ongoing TRPA Regional Plan update. The Draft RPU, Policy HS-3.1 states:

TRPA shall regularly review its policies and regulations to remove identified barriers preventing the construction of necessary affordable housing in the region. TRPA staff will work with local jurisdictions to address issues including, but not limited to, workforce and moderate income housing, secondary residential units and long term residency is motel units in accordance with the timeline outlined in the Implementation Element.

The County will also continue to implement the employee housing requirements established on new commercial developments in the Tahoe region.

#### **B. Potential Non-Governmental Constraints**

The availability and cost of housing is strongly influenced by market forces over which local governments have little or no control. Nonetheless, State law requires that the Housing Element contain a general assessment of these constraints, which can serve as the basis for actions to offset their effects. The primary non-governmental constraints to the development of new housing



in Placer County can be broken into the following categories: availability of financing, development costs, and community sentiment.

# 1. Availability of Financing

For credit-worthy projects, residential construction loan rates are currently (2012) extremely low. However, since interest rates reflect deliberate monetary policy selected by the Federal Reserve Board, it is not possible to forecast what will happen to interest rates during the upcoming Housing Element planning period, but rates are not expected to drop from the historic lows of today (2012). If interest rates rise, not only will it make new construction more costly (since construction period loans are short term and bear a higher interest rate that amortized mortgages), but it will also lower the sales price that buyers can afford to pay.

Mortgage interest rates are also currently (2012) historically low. This makes it easier for households to finance house purchases. However, due to the recent collapse of the "sub-prime" mortgage market, loan qualification standards are considerably stricter and the availability of financing is considerably reduced. As a note, in the calculations for the ability to pay for housing examples shown earlier in this document, a seven-percent interest rate was used to accommodate a potential increase in interest rates in the future. Recent changes in the mortgage industry also require larger down-payments when purchasing a home.

# 2. Development Costs

#### **Land Costs**

Costs associated with the acquisition of land include both the market price of raw land and the cost of holding the property throughout the development process. Land acquisition costs can account for over half of the final sales price of new homes in very small developments and in areas where land is scarce.

Raw land costs vary substantially across the county based on a number of factors and due to the collapse of the housing market, prices are down considerably from the peak of the market several years ago. The main determinants of land value are location, proximity to public services, zoning, and parcel size. Land in a desirable area that is zoned for residential uses will likely be more valuable than a remote piece of land that is zoned for agricultural uses.

As properties begin to get closer to existing development with zoning regulations that allow for more dense development, the typical sale price per acre increases. Based on market data, pure agricultural values appear to be between \$6,000 and \$8,000 per acre. For buildable parcels, sale prices typically range from \$20,000 to \$30,000 per acre depending on property attributes and if utilities available.

Land within spheres of influence typically sells within the \$27,000 to \$40,000 per acre range. Recent land sales (2009-2012) put approved, but unimproved lots selling in the \$16,000 to \$20,000 range (down from \$50,000 at the height of the market in 2005-06). Ready-to-build lots in subdivisions have been selling for between \$60,000 and \$100,000 per lot (2012).



Based on a small sample of properties listed for sale in the Tahoe Basin, raw land was listed for around \$800,000 per acre, and some entitled lots were listed at nearly \$2 million dollars for a 5,000 square foot subdivided lot.

#### **Construction Costs**

Construction costs vary widely depending on the type, size, and amenities of the development. According to Placer County Supervising Building Inspector Ken Sibley, the average construction costs in Placer County in 2012 are approximately \$100 to \$135 per square foot.

In the Tahoe Basin portion of Placer County, construction costs are somewhat greater. A developer with experience building affordable housing in the Tahoe Basin estimated that construction costs are currently (2012) between \$125 and \$175 per square foot in the Tahoe Basin. This cost does not include land cost, fees, and entitlement costs—all of which cost significantly more in the Tahoe Basin than in other areas of the county.

The competition for labor and materials during the housing boom ending in 2005 caused an increase in labor and material costs; however, this competition has now diminished with the recent decline in the housing market, causing labor costs to drop and material prices to stabilize. While the economy is now beginning to recover from the recession, a study by McGraw-Hill Construction shows that 69 percent of architect, engineer, and contractor professionals expect workforce shortages in the next three years. The downturn in construction activity caused many workers to leave the profession and few of these workers are expected to return.

High construction costs coupled with high land costs make it difficult for private sector developers to provide housing for lower-income residents. Subsidies, incentives, and other types of financial assistance are available to private sector developers to bridge the gap between actual costs of development and the sale price of affordable housing.

## **Total Housing Development Costs**

As shown in Table 68, the total of all housing development costs discussed above for a typical entry-level single-family home (1,500 square feet) in the unincorporated county is roughly \$258,000 including site improvements, construction costs, fees and permits, and land costs.

Table 68 ESTIMATED SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT COSTS				
Placer County 2012				
Type of Cost	Amount			
Land Costs (one acre)	\$25,000			
Site Improvement Costs	\$15,000			
Total Construction Cost	\$176,250			
Total Development Impact Fees	\$41,788			
Total Housing Development Costs	\$258,038			

Source: Placer County, 2012.



TABLE 69 ESTIMATED MULTIFAMILY HOUSING DEVELOPMENT COSTS Placer County 2012				
Type of Cost	Amount			
Land Costs	\$25,000			
Site Improvement Costs	\$20,000			
Total Construction Cost (1,000 ft. at 125/sf)	125,000			
Total Development Impact Fees	\$29,688			
Total Housing Development Costs	\$199,688			

Source: Placer County, 2012.

# 3. Community Sentiment

Community attitude toward housing can play a crucial role in determining the type and cost of housing that will be built. While there is a general recognition of the need for more affordable housing in Placer County's communities, during the Housing Element workshops, meetings, and hearings, some residents voiced a concern about the design incompatibility of many affordable housing projects. Some community members perceive the concentration of affordable, high-density housing as a potential for the development of slums. Applying local design guidelines and standards can help lessen the public's negative perceptions of affordable housing.

Developers of potentially controversial housing complexes can deal with opposition by addressing legitimate community concerns regarding the type of housing, noise, traffic, and the impact that the proposed development will have on County services. A key to successfully obtaining development approvals is to obtain the support of local community groups and organizations. Involving the community in the early phases of the project is essential for creating the basis for cooperation and constructive participation in the planning process.

# **SECTION IV: EVALUATION**

# A. Housing Accomplishments

# 1. 2007 to 2012 Accomplishments

One important step that the County has undertaken to provide greater housing opportunities is the approval of the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan in July 2007. The Placer Vineyards Specific Plan will guide development of approximately 5,230 acres of land located in the southwest corner of Placer County approximately 15 miles north of the City of Sacramento. The project will include 14,132 dwelling units. An application was received in October 2012 to revise the Specific Plan to allow for 21,631 dwelling units.



Placer County has adopted the Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG) Affordable Housing Compact. The SACOG compact provides for voluntary production standards that the County applies to Specific Plan projects. At least 10 percent of all new housing construction should meet an affordability standard. The 10 percent goal is guided by the following rules:

- At least 4 percent of all new housing construction will be affordable to very low-income families.
- At least 4 percent of all new housing construction will be affordable to low-income families.
- Up to 2 percent of the 10 percent goal could be met by housing affordable to moderate-income families.

Placer Vineyards' 1,372 affordable units (2,122 units if proposed Specific Plan amendment is approved) must be developed concurrent with market rate units or upon established triggers for construction as set forth in the development agreement.

There are two additional Specific Plans that have been approved since 2007. The 506-acre Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan proposal includes a maximum of 933 residential units consisting of low, medium, and high density development as well as rural and agricultural residences in the Dry Creek area of Western Placer County. This project has an affordable housing component of 93 units. The Specific Plan was approved by the County in 2009.

The Regional University Specific Plan includes 1,136 acres in the unincorporated portion of southwest Placer County. The site is located south of Pleasant Grove Creek between Brewer Road and the western boundary of the City of Roseville. A total of 3,232 dwelling units are planned with 316 units designated as affordable according to the ten percent affordability requirement. The Specific Plan was approved in 2008.

## **Workforce Housing**

An employee housing ordinance was drafted in 2003 but has not been adopted. The County requires residential and commercial projects in the Tahoe-Sierra region to comply with the Housing Element Policy C-2. New projects in the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe areas are required to mitigate potential impacts to employee housing by housing 50 percent of the full-time equivalent employees (FTEE) generated by the development.

Placer County has required resorts to provide or finance workforce housing since 1992. But the policy allows resorts to pay in-lieu fees that are insufficient to develop housing. The proposed ordinance would extend requirements to other types of development around Lake Tahoe and close the existing loopholes by indexing in-lieu fees to inflation. Commercial, industrial, recreational, resort, and office developments that generate fewer than five full-time equivalent employees are exempt, as are renovation projects where the building size, the number of dwelling units or the number of employees is not increased. An in-lieu fee and dedication of land are options available to certain project types.



Several workforce housing projects have been approved in the Lake Tahoe region. Sawmill Heights, a 96-unit affordable housing development with 240 bedrooms was built at the Northstar development as part of the ski resort's expansion project. The County Housing Trust Fund loaned \$350,000 to Northstar Community Housing for deeper targeting to restrict 12 units to lowincome affordability. The employee housing development which opened in late-2006 is located off of Highway 267 at Northstar Drive. The County recently forgave its loan to the project and the affordability restriction was extended for an additional 35 years until 2061.

Hopkins Ranch, currently under construction, will provide 50 affordable duplex-style units in Martis Valley. The units are being constructed to meet the affordable housing conditions associated with the Martis Camp housing and golf course development.

One project in the entitlement stage, the Squaw Valley Specific Plan, is expected to have a significant workforce housing requirement. The specific plan proposes a recreation-based, allseason resort community consisting of 1,335 residential and guest accommodation units and commercial space to be built in four phases over a 12 to 15 year period. The workforce housing obligation for the project has not been determined as of yet.

#### Children's Shelter

The County has shown continual dedication to meeting the needs of families. In late-March 2008, the County opened its new state-of-the-art Children's Emergency Shelter and Health Center in North Auburn. It replaced the county's existing Children's Receiving Home for children who have been abused or neglected. The new Children's Emergency Shelter on 3.6 acres includes an administration building, the residential and common living spaces of the shelter, an education building, and gymnasium, as well as outdoor recreation areas. Total project cost was \$11.5 million and included \$300,000 from the Housing Trust Fund.

#### **Emergency Shelters/Transitional Housing**

The County updated its Zoning Ordinance to bring the Code into compliance with State housing law for emergency shelters, transitional housing, single-room occupancy residential units, and supportive housing. The amendments established definitions for each, identified appropriate zoning districts where these uses are allowed, and development standards that apply to the units.

#### Farmworker Housing

The County amended the Zoning Ordinance to ensure that permit processing procedures for farmworker housing do not conflict with Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6. Agricultural farm employee housing is now an allowed use in the Residential-Agricultural (RA), Residential Forest (RF), Agricultural Exclusive (AE), Farm (F), Forestry (FOR), and Open Space (O) zone districts.

#### Community House of Kings Beach (Mental Health and Support Services)

The Placer County Board of Supervisors recently (October 2012) committed \$500,000 in State funding to support the Community House of Kings Beach, a proposed drop-in center for mental



health and support services. The funds will help finance the purchase and renovation of a former motel and residence at 265 Bear Street in Kings Beach by the Community House of Tahoe Truckee Community Foundation. The property will be turned into a community center that will house the project's three main partners: the Tahoe Safe Alliance, North Tahoe Family Resource Center, and Project MANA. The center also will provide desks for other service providers, four individual counseling rooms, a children's therapy area, and designated space for family team meetings.

The County Health and Human Services Department estimates the community center will serve about 3,000 people annually. The \$500,000 will come from funds Placer County receives from the State under the California Mental Health Services Act (MHSA). In a plan approved by the state in 2009, Placer County identified a community center committed to providing mental health and other services at North Lake Tahoe as a proposed use of MHSA funds earmarked for capital facility and technology projects.

# 2. On-Going Efforts

Several housing policies are already in effect in Placer County to create affordable housing, and others are being considered.

Interagency cooperation is an absolute imperative to increase the supply of affordable housing in the Tahoe basin. Placer County continues to collaborate with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency to modify policies that are negatively impacting the creation of affordable housing in the Tahoe Basin. TRPA is currently (2012) working to update its Regional Plan which is expected to go before the TRPA Board for approval in December 2012. Providing a variety of housing choices around the basin has been identified as a top priority. Coordinating policy integration between TRPA's planning efforts and County plans will be ongoing.

Placer County has begun the process of updating its Tahoe Community/General Plans. The County's Update is being coordinated with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's Regional Plan Update. Land Use, Housing, Circulation, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, and Safety. Community Plans within the Tahoe Basin must be consistent with the TRPA Regional Plan.

## **Housing Preservation and Construction**

Affordable housing developers (private for-profit and non-profit companies) can play a significant role in assisting the County to meet its affordable housing objectives. Prior to dissolution, the Redevelopment Agency currently had \$2 million of Housing Set-Aside funds available to loan to affordable housing developers in western Placer County. New construction, rehabilitation and/or acquisition projects were eligible. Four projects were funded using Set-Aside funding. USA Properties has been offered assistance to construct the Quartz Ridge project, a 64-unit affordable housing project on County-owned land in North Auburn. AMIH was given funds to rehabilitate a group home in the City of Rocklin. Habitat for Humanity also received funding to help construct two homes within the City of Rocklin.



Placer County supports homeownership though the First Time Homebuyer Down Payment Assistance Program. Since the program was adopted in 2000, the County has provided financial assistance to 57 low-income homeowners to purchase homes in the county. The County supports investment in the existing housing stock through the County's Housing Rehabilitation Program.

The former Redevelopment Agency provided financial assistance to DOMUS to construct 77 affordable housing units on five sites in Kings Beach. Funding included \$7,918,300 in redevelopment monies, \$2 million in HOME funds applied for by the County on behalf of the applicant, and a \$3,314,400 Infill Infrastructure Grant also applied for by the County. The majority of the remainder of funding necessary to construct the project was from Tax Credits.

The County continues to apply for Federal and State housing funds to continue its housing rehabilitation programs. The County received \$500,000 in CDBG funds to be used for housing rehab loans in Kings Beach and a \$289,000 grant for housing rehab loans in Sheridan.

Seniors First is a private, non-profit corporation that provides health and safety repair services to elderly/disabled households free of charge recently received \$45,000 in County funding. Services are provided to very low-, low-, and moderate-income seniors, and very low-, low-, and moderate-income disabled people who are owner-occupants of these residences in the unincorporated areas of Placer County. Services cannot exceed \$1,300.

# B. Review of Existing (2008) Housing Element

The following section reviews and evaluates the County's progress in implementing the 2008 Housing Element. It reviews the results and effectiveness of policies, programs, and objectives for the previous Housing Element planning period. Table 70 and Table 71 provide an evaluation of the 2008 Placer County Housing Element's policies and implementation programs.



	Table 70					
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES					
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation		
A-1	The County shall maintain an adequate supply of appropriately zoned land with public services to accommodate housing needs of existing and future residents.	Ongoing	The County will analyze requiring minimum densities in areas designated for multi-family housing development.	Retain policy		
A-2	The County shall ensure that its adopted policies, regulations, and procedures do not add unnecessarily to the cost of housing while still attaining other important County objectives.	Ongoing	Current County policy, but consistent review is necessary.	Retain policy		
A-3	The County shall encourage innovative subdivision design and a range of housing types within larger-scale development projects to encourage mixed-income communities (e.g., single-family detached homes, second units, duplexes, live-work units).	Ongoing	Specific Plans and other large projects are encouraged to provide a mix of housing types.	Retain policy		
A-4	The County shall encourage mixed-use and transit-oriented development projects where housing is provided in conjunction with compatible non-residential uses.	Ongoing	Strategic planning is needed to allow for mixed- use development in appropriate areas of the County. The County has proposed creation of a "mixed-use" zone district that would allow for higher density residential development.	Modify policy to focus on multi-family development. Combine with Policy A-7.		
A-5	The County shall encourage residential infill development through flexible development standards, and other incentives in areas of the county where adequate public facilities and services are already in place.	Incomplete	This program has not been accomplished.	Retain policy		
A-6	The County shall encourage residential development of high architectural and physical quality.	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy		
A-7	The County shall encourage the development of multi-family dwellings in locations where adequate infrastructure and public services are available.	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy		
A-8	Placer County shall continue to implement the policies and requirements of the Placer County Design Guidelines Manual and community design elements of the various community plans.	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy. The Landscape Design Guidelines are currently being updated.	Retain policy		
B-1	The County shall give highest priority for permit processing to development projects that include an affordable residential	Ongoing	The County gives priority to affordable housing projects for both planning and building permit	Retain policy		



	Table 70 Evaluation of 2008 Placer County Housing Element Policies					
	Policies Status Evaluation Recommendation					
	component.		reviews.			
B-2	The County shall consider the appropriateness of County-owned surplus land for affordable housing. If found appropriate for housing, the County may lease, sell or grant such property to facilitate the construction of affordable housing.	Ongoing	County-owned surplus land, particularly at the DeWitt complex in North Auburn, may be suitable for affordable housing. A proposed master plan for the DeWitt complex is an opportunity to designate parcels for high-density affordable housing.	Retain policy		
B-3	The County shall continue to apply for funds from the State and Federal government to construct and preserve affordable housing.	Ongoing	The County continues to pursue housing programs and funding which are available at the State and Federal levels.	Retain policy		
B-4	The County shall require housing for low-income households that is to be constructed on-site in a new residential project to be dispersed throughout the project to the extent practical given the size of the project and other site constraints.	Ongoing	This is current County policy and has been implemented at several developments including the Lariat Ranch subdivision in North Auburn.	Retain policy		
B-5	Affordable housing produced through government subsidies and/or through incentives or regulatory programs shall be distributed throughout the County and not concentrated in a particular area or community.	Ongoing	Affordable housing tends to be concentrated in North Auburn and Kings Beach primarily due to their former status as Redevelopment areas. Siting is limited due to infrastructure constraints. Affordable housing shall be integrated into Community Plans.	Retain policy, but modify to address infrastructure constraints.		
B-6	The County shall require low-income-housing units in density bonus, or other projects that may be required to provide affordable housing, to be developed in a timely manner with the market-rate units in the project to avoid delaying the construction of the affordable units to the end of the project.	Ongoing	This is current County policy. For Specific Plan projects, the construction of affordable units is typically spelled out in Development Agreements and must be built as specified development milestones are reached.	Retain policy		
B-7	The County shall facilitate expanded housing opportunities that are affordable to the workforce of Placer County.	Ongoing	The County has completed a draft employee housing ordinance that has not been adopted. In the meantime, the policy is being applied to residential and non-residential projects in the Tahoe area.	Retain policy		



	Table 70					
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES					
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation		
B-8	The Redevelopment Agency shall utilize at least 20 percent of all tax increment proceeds for low-income housing, in accordance with State law. Furthermore, a portion of all units built in the redevelopment area shall be affordable to very low-, low- and moderate-income households, as required by State law.	Discontinued	The Redevelopment Agency was dissolved in February 2012.	Discontinue policy		
B-9	For residential projects outside of a specific plan area where more than 10 percent of the units are affordable to very low-income households, or 20 percent are affordable to low-income households, or 30 percent are affordable to moderate-income households, 100 percent of the development-related fees over which the County has direct control shall be waived.	Ongoing	This fee reduction policy is utilized as opportunity arises.	Retain policy		
B-10	On a case-by-case basis, when evaluating possible reductions in development standards to encourage affordable housing, the County shall also consider public health, safety, and other important standards such as adequate open space in developments.	Ongoing	This has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy		
B-11	The County shall continue efforts to streamline and improve the development review process, and to eliminate any unnecessary delays in the processing of development applications.	Ongoing	The County consistently looks for ways to streamline the permitting and development review process. The County's permit tracking software has been extremely helpful in coordinating County approvals and will allow for future electronic filing of permits by the public.	Retain policy. Move to Section A.		
B-12	The County shall continue to give highest priority in the development review process to senior housing, very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing projects.	Ongoing	The County gives priority to affordable housing projects for both planning and building permit reviews.	Remove, repeat of Policy B-1		
B-13	The County shall continue to implement the following incentive programs for the construction of affordable housing: Allow second residential units with single-family residences; Allow mobile homes and manufactured housing in all residential zoning districts;	Ongoing	These policies have resulted in a number of affordable housing units and will be continued.	Retain policy		



	Table 70						
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES						
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation			
	Allow "hardship mobile homes" as second residential units in residential and/or agricultural zones; and, Allow relief from parking standards and other specified development standards on developments for seniors and for low and very low-income residents.						
B-14	To preserve homeownership and promote neighborhood stability, the County shall attempt to alleviate individual and community issues associated with foreclosures.	Ongoing	This is handled through code enforcement.	Retain policy			
B-15	The County shall require that any privately-initiated proposal to amend a General Plan or Community Plan land use designation of Agricultural/Timberland, Resort and Recreation, Open Space, General Commercial, Tourist/Resort Commercial, or Business Park/Industrial to a land use designation of Residential or Specific Plan shall include an affordable housing component subject to approval by County and/or comply with any adopted County affordable housing program.	Ongoing	An affordable housing program has not been adopted. Applicants are required to provide an affordable housing component with the noted land use designation changes.	Retain policy			
B-16	The County currently requires 10 percent of residential units in specific plans be affordable (4 percent very-low, 4 percent low, 2 percent moderate). On a case-by-case basis, the County shall consider allowing developers that provide extremely low-income units to reduce the required percentage of other affordable units.	Ongoing	This policy has been in place but not yet utilized by any developers.	Retain policy			
C-1	The County shall encourage the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) to: (a) strengthen the effectiveness of existing incentive programs for the production of affordable housing in the Lake Tahoe Region and (b) change its regulations to permit second residential units.	Ongoing	County staff is working with TRPA and other jurisdictions on an update to the Tahoe Basin Regional Plan. Additional measures to encourage affordable housing production are being considered. The County is also seeking to allow secondary units on parcels less than one-acre in size.	Retain policy			
C-2	The County shall require new development in the Sierra Nevada	Ongoing	This is current County policy. An in-lieu fee has	Modify policy			



Table 70							
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES						
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation			
	and Lake Tahoe areas to provide for employee housing equal to at least 50 percent of the housing demand generated by the project. If the project is an expansion of an existing use, the requirement shall only apply to that portion of the project that is expanded (e.g., the physical footprint of the project or an intensification of the use).  Employee housing shall be provided for in one of the following ways:  Construction of on-site employee housing; Construction of off-site employee housing; Dedication of land for needed units; and/or Payment of an in-lieu fee.		not been determined. Therefore, applicants have been required to build the employee housing. An affordable housing 'bank' has been considered but not implemented.				
C-3	The County shall work with the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) to encourage the construction of larger units (i.e., three or more bedrooms) for families in the Kings Beach area.	Ongoing	Incomplete.	Delete policy. No longer applicable since the Regional Plan Update is complete.			
D-1	The County shall continue to make rehabilitation loans to low-income households from its CDBG program revolving loan funds.	Ongoing	This program is now being managed by the Planning Division.	Repetitive with Policy D-2			
D-2	The County shall continue to apply for CDBG, HOME, and other similar State and Federal funding for the purpose of rehabilitating low-cost, owner-occupied, and rental housing. Additionally, the County shall seek to obtain additional Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers.	Ongoing	The Planning Division will continue to apply for funding from State and Federal sources. The Housing Authority will seek to obtain additional Section 8 vouchers.	Modify policy to remove reference to Section 8, since this is covered in Policy D.7.			
D-3	The County shall discourage the conversion of mobile home parks to other types of housing and to other land uses except where the living conditions within such parks are such that an alternative land use will better serve the community and/or the residents of the mobile home park or the conversion results in	Ongoing	This has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy			



Table 70							
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES						
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation			
	the replacement of such affordable housing.						
D-4	The County shall require the abatement of unsafe housing conditions while giving property owners adequate time to correct deficiencies.	Ongoing	This is standard procedure for the Placer County Code Enforcement division.	Retain policy			
D-5	The County shall allow the demolition of existing multi-family units only when a structure is found to be substandard and unsuitable for rehabilitation.	Ongoing	This has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy			
D-6	The County shall support efforts to convert mobile home parks where residents lease their spaces to parks where residents own their spaces.	Ongoing	No opportunities have been realized to further this program.	Retain policy			
D-7	The County shall continue to provide Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher assistance to eligible households and pursue funding for additional vouchers.	Ongoing	This program is managed by the Housing Authority.	Retain policy, but move to Section B.			
D-8	The County shall allow dwellings to be rehabilitated that do not meet current lot size, setback, or other current zoning standards, so long as the non-conformity is not increased and there is no threat to public health and/or safety.	Ongoing	This has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy			
D-9	The County shall adhere to State law requiring tenant notice and landlord relocation assistance in cases of demolition of multifamily housing.	Ongoing	The County continues to monitor multi-family residential demolitions to ensure compliance with State laws.	Retain policy			
D-10	The County shall adhere to the requirements of State law regarding mobile home conversions.	Ongoing	The County continues to monitor conversions of mobile home parks to ensure compliance with State laws.	Retain policy			
D-11	The County's Code Enforcement Officers shall continue to work with property owners to preserve the existing housing stock.	Ongoing	This is standard procedure for the Placer County Code Enforcement division.	Retain policy			
E-1	The County shall strive to preserve all at-risk dwelling units in the unincorporated County.	Ongoing	The County continues to monitor at-risk dwelling units and seeks ways to provide for permanent affordability.	Retain policy			
E-2	The County shall require at least two years notice prior to the	Ongoing	As the first agreement nears end in 2014, the	Retain policy			



Table 70							
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES						
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation			
	conversion of any deed-restricted affordable units to market rate in any of the following circumstances:  The units were constructed with the aid of government funding; The units were required by an affordable housing program; The project was granted a density bonus; and/or The project received other incentives. Such notice will be given, at a minimum, to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD), the Placer County Housing Authority, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency, and the residents of at-risk units.		County needs to analyze the cost of keeping the units as affordable and take measures to ensure continued affordability.				
F-1	The County shall encourage the development of housing for seniors, including congregate care facilities.	Ongoing	A number of senior care facilities have been approved in recent years including the Timberline project in North Auburn consisting of nine two-and three-story independent living buildings, 72 villa duplexes, 68 detached villas, two independent living buildings, and four retirement "common buildings" that in total equal 780 living units.	Retain policy			
F-2	County policies, programs and ordinances shall provide opportunities for persons with disabilities to reside in all neighborhoods.	Ongoing	A Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance was adopted in 2008.	Retain policy			
F-3	The County shall reduce parking requirements for special needs housing if a proponent can demonstrate a reduced parking need.	Ongoing	This has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy			
F-4	In accordance with the Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance, the County shall continue to streamline County procedures related to accessibility and adaptability of housing for persons with disabilities.	Ongoing	The County continues to implement the Reasonable Accommodation Ordinance. The requirement to notify nearby property owners of a RA request should be revisited for potential deletion.	Modify policy			
F-5	The County shall continue to facilitate efforts of individuals, private organizations, and public agencies to provide safe and	Ongoing	A farmworker housing Zoning Text Amendment was approved in 2012.	Retain policy. Combine with Policy F-6.			



TABLE 70							
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES						
	Policies Status Evaluation Recommendation						
	adequate housing for farmworkers.						
F-6	The County shall support appropriate amounts of farmworker and farm family housing in agriculturally-zoned areas where it promotes efficiency in the farming operation and has minimal impact on productive farmland.	Ongoing	A farmworker housing Zoning Text Amendment was approved in 2012.	Retain policy. Combine with Policy F-5.			
F7	The County shall continue to implement the incentive programs for senior housing, including the density bonus ordinance and priority processing.	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy			
G-1	The County shall continue to support emergency shelter programs, such as the Gathering Inn, that provide shelter in centralized locations, which are accessible to the majority of homeless persons in the County.	Ongoing	The County should consider additional ways to support the Gathering Inn or other shelter programs operating within Placer County.	Expand policy			
G-2	The County shall continue to assist various non-profit organizations involved with emergency shelter(s) and other aids to homeless persons.	In Progress	The County and its partners' efforts are aimed at preventing homelessness through housing, services and support.	Follow Ten Year Homelessness Plan			
G-3	The County shall assess the system-wide delivery of services and expenditures aimed at assisting those who are homeless to ensure that funding is appropriated judiciously and local efforts are not duplicated.	Ongoing	Delivery of services was examined while creating the Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in Placer County (2004).	Follow and Update the Ten Year Homelessness Plan			
G-4	The County shall continue to work with local organizations at the community level through the Continuum of Care strategy to address homelessness and associated services issue, which may include a homeless crisis intake center to better assist those who wish to move from homelessness to self-sufficiency.	In Progress	Placer County participates in the Placer Consortium on Homelessness and Affordable Housing. A Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness in Placer County was initiated in 2004.	Retain policy			
H-1	The County shall require that all new dwelling units meet current State requirements for energy efficiency, and encourage developers to exceed Title 24 requirements. Retrofitting of existing units shall be encouraged.	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy			
H-2	The County shall promote land use patterns that encourage energy efficiency, to the extent feasible.	Ongoing	Energy efficiency issues are addressed in Specific Plan, CEQA documents and during project review	Retain policy			



Table 70 EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES					
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation	
			and permitting.		
H-3	The County shall provide incentives, such as streamlined and expedited approval processes, for housing built using green building standards.	Incomplete	This has not been completed. Green building elements have been incorporated into the new CA State Building Code.	Remove policy	
H-4	The County shall continue to implement provisions of the Subdivision Map Act that require subdivisions to be oriented for solar access, to the extent practical.	Ongoing	The County reviews solar access issues during the project review and permitting process.	Retain policy	
I-1	The County shall promote housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, color, ancestry, national origin, sex, disability, family status, income, sexual orientation, or other barriers that prevent choice in housing.	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy	
I-2	The County shall promote the enforcement of the policies of the State Fair Employment and Housing Commission.	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy	
J-1	The County shall continuously work to improve the day-to-day implementation of Housing Element programs.	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy.	Retain policy	

Source: Placer County, 2012.



	Table 71 EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT PROGRAMS					
	Programs	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation		
A-1	As part of a General Plan update or amendment, and as part of each community plan update, the County shall review land use patterns, existing densities, the location of job centers, and the availability of services to identify additional areas that may be suitable for higher density residential development to ensure that a sufficient supply of residentially-zoned land is available to achieve the County's housing objectives.	Ongoing	The County continues to evaluate land uses when updating Community Plans to ensure a sufficient supply of residentially-zoned land.  The County expects to begin a comprehensive update to the General Plan in 2013. Two Community Plan updates are currently underway: Tahoe Basin and Sheridan. The Granite Bay Community Plan was adopted in February 2012 but did not change land use.	Retain program		
A-2	The County shall amend land use regulations and development standards (e.g., Department of Public Works and Fire Department regulations) where feasible to remove unnecessary impediments to and reduce the cost of the production of housing.	Incomplete	This program has not been accomplished.	Delete program; too vague.		
A-3	The County shall periodically review and update, as necessary, the Public Facilities and Services Element of the General Plan, which is a strategy for extending services and facilities to areas that are designated for residential development but do not currently have access to public facilities.	Planned	Element to be updated during General Plan Update starting in 2013.	Retain program		
A-4	The County shall create a mixed-use zoning overlay district and prepare related design guidelines. The County shall also adopt incentives for residential development that is part of a mixed-use project, including but not limited to relaxed development standards, reduced parking requirements, and expedited development review procedures.	Planned	Not adopted. Anticipated to be part of General Plan Update.	Retain program		
A-5	The County shall create an infill development overlay district and prepare related guidelines that allow flexibility in lot sizes, building height, setbacks, site planning, parking requirements, and other development standards to encourage high-density and affordable housing in proximity to transit services.	Planned	Not adopted. Anticipated to be part of General Plan Update or a separate Zoning Text Amendment.	Delete program. This would be accomplished through a new mixed-use zone (Program A-4).		



	Table 70					
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES					
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation		
A-6	To facilitate development of infill projects, the County shall adopt an Infill Incentive Ordinance to assist developers in addressing barriers to infill development. Incentives could include, but are not limited to, modifications of development standards, such as reduced parking, increased building height, reduced street width, and relaxed setback requirements to accommodate smaller or odd-shaped parcels; waivers or deferrals of certain development fees, helping to decrease or defer the costs of development; or direct grants from the County.	Planned	Not adopted. Anticipated to be part of General Plan Update.	Delete program. This would be accomplished through a new mixed-use zone (Program A-4).		
A-7	Due to the loss of multi-family sites to single-family construction, the County shall adopt a Zoning Ordinance amendment to set a minimum density standard for single-family homes in the Multi-Family Residential (RM) zoning district, and prohibit the development of single-family homes in the zoning district unless built to the new minimum density.	Planned	Not implemented. Anticipated to be part of General Plan Update.	Retain program		
A-8	The County shall conduct a nexus study to analyze impact fees and planning-related fees associated with residential and non-residential development. The County shall determine whether or not the fees collected in the county are appropriate and fair. In conducting the study, the County shall compare Placer County's fee structure with fees collected in other nearby jurisdictions.	Ongoing	The County periodically reviews fees to assure the fee schedule is in line with fees charged by nearby jurisdictions.	Retain program		
B-1	The County shall evaluate all County-owned surplus land to determine its suitability for workforce and affordable housing. This evaluation should include the identification of appropriate entities to hold or acquire such land. The County shall also indentify a process for transferring the properties to these entities, including procedures for land exchanges if sites more suitable for affordable and workforce housing are to identified.	Ongoing	County-owned sites have been included on the vacant land inventory.	Retain program		



	Table 70 Evaluation of 2008 Placer County Housing Element Policies					
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation		
	Affordable housing developed under this program shall have 55-year affordability covenants for multi-family rental units and 45-year affordability covenants for ownership units.					
B-2	The County shall partner with existing non-profit and for-profit corporations that are interested and able to construct and manage workforce and affordable housing. The County may provide technical and/or financial assistance, such as, site identification, site acquisition, and identification of subsidy sources including HOME funds, CDBG monies, fee waivers, and permit processing.	Ongoing	Before its dissolution, the Redevelopment Agency selected USA Properties Fund to construct a 64-unit affordable housing project on County-owned land in North Auburn. The developer is seeking low income housing tax credits in order to build the project.	Retain program		
B-3	The County shall amend engineering standards and the subdivision and zoning ordinances to allow flexibility in certain development standards as incentives for affordable housing developments. The County shall ensure that adjusting development standards for affordable housing does not result in lower quality housing or higher replacement or maintenance costs in the future. The County shall consider site and potential occupancy characteristics when amending development standards.	Ongoing	Anticipated to be part of General Plan Update.	Retain program		
B-4	The County shall use the density bonus ordinance to encourage rental and for-sale housing. Developments with more than four units that provide at least 20 percent of the units as affordable to low-income households or 10 percent of the units as affordable to very low-income households may be eligible for a density bonus of 25 percent. As a condition of approval for the density bonus, the units must remain affordable for at least 30 years. The County shall promote the benefits of this program to the development community by posting information on their web page and creating a handout to be distributed with land development applications.	Ongoing	Several density bonus projects have been approved in recent years including Ridgeview Villas, Terracina Oaks, and Atwood Village.	Retain program		



	Table 70						
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES						
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation			
B-5	The County shall adopt a resolution waiving 100 percent of the application processing fees for developments in which 10 percent of the units are affordable to very low-income households, 20 percent of the units are affordable to low-income households, or 30 percent of the units are affordable to moderate-income households. Additionally, the County shall evaluate waiving environmental review staff time charges for projects containing affordable housing units. To be eligible for fee waiver, the units shall be affordable by affordability covenant. The waiving or reduction of service mitigation fees may also be considered when an alternative funding source is identified to pay these fees.	Incomplete	Resolution in draft form, not adopted.	Retain program			
B-6	Consistent with State law, twenty percent of the tax increment funds accruing to the Redevelopment Agency shall be directed to affordable housing.	Discontinued	Redevelopment was dissolved in February 2012. The County acquired a six-acre site in the former North Auburn Redevelopment Area and has selected USA Properties to construct a 64-unit affordable housing project on the property. The County through RDA also spent approx. \$5.5 million acquiring four properties for the DOMUS project in Kings Beach.	Remove program			
B-7	The County shall continue to use the Housing Trust Fund to acquire building sites for affordable housing, to provide "gap" financing, to leverage funds for acquiring or constructing affordable housing, to continue to provide secured loans to affordable housing developers for up-front costs, or to subsidize the service and mitigation fee waivers for affordable housing developments.	Discontinued	Housing Trust Fund moneys were used to assist the DOMUS project in Kings Beach. The \$34 million project will construct 77 units on the five sites. Of those, 75 will be deed restricted for low-income residents who earn between 30 percent and 60 percent of the area median income. The remaining two units will be for on-site managers. The last phase of the project was recently completed.  Redevelopment was dissolved in February 2012.	Remove program			



	Table 70						
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES						
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation			
B-8	Placer County shall continue to identify financial institutions operating in the county that fall under the requirements of the Community Reinvestment Act and work with these institutions to provide financing for low- and moderate-income housing.	Ongoing	Financial institutions operating in the County that fall under the requirements of the Community Reinvestment Act have been identified.	Retain program			
B-9	The County shall investigate and, where deemed eligible, apply for State and Federal monies for direct support of low-income housing construction and rehabilitation. The Redevelopment Agency and Health and Human Services shall continue to assess potential funding sources, such as, but not limited to, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), and HOME. The County shall promote the benefits of this program to the development community by posting information on its web page and creating a handout to be distributed with land development applications.	Ongoing	The County will continue to apply for Federal and State housing program funds as available to continue and expand affordable housing programs. A number of sources have been used to assist the DOMUS project in Kings Beach including a \$3.3 million grant through the State Infill Infrastructure program.  The County received \$500,000 in Community Development Block Grant funds to be used for housing rehabilitation loans in Kings Beach and a \$289,000 grant for housing rehabilitation loans in Sheridan.  The County was recently awarded \$585,000 for the agency's First-Time Homebuyer Assistance Program and \$195,000 for an Owner-Occupied Housing Rehabilitation Program	Retain program			
B-10	The County shall consider adopting an affordable housing program that applies to areas of the County under 5,000 feet in elevation. If adopted, this program will identify acceptable methods for new residential developments to provide affordable housing which may include a) construction of housing on-site, b) construction of housing off-site; c) dedication of land for housing, and d) payment of an in-lieu fee.	Incomplete	Draft Ordinance prepared, not adopted.	Retain program			
B-11	Although the County currently offers permit streamlining, priority processing, and concurrent processing for senior and affordable housing developments, the County shall review its	Complete	The County gives priority to affordable housing projects for both planning and building permit reviews.	Remove program			



	Table 70						
	EVALUATION OF 2008 PLACER COUNTY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES						
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation			
	residential processing procedures, as appropriate, to identify opportunities to further streamline processing procedures while maintaining adequate levels of public review.						
B-12	The County shall amend the zoning ordinance to allow accessory apartments, such as detached units over garages, by right within all residential zones to provide another source of affordable housing. The amendments will ensure that the County's Zoning Ordinance is consistent with State law requirements for second units. Additionally, the County shall consider streamlining the approval process for secondary units, as well as allowing second units on smaller parcels than what is currently allowed.	Incomplete	Accessory apartments are now allowed as a matter-of-right, subject to a zoning review. A revised ordinance to allow accessory units on smaller lot sizes has not been prepared.	Retain program; modify to address multi-generational housing.			
B-13	The County shall investigate land banking as a method to provide sites for affordable housing.	Incomplete	The County had been working with the Placer Collaborative Network to establish a Housing Land Trust in the county. That effort has been discontinued due to the difficult real estate market.	Remove program			
B-14	The County shall publicize information on the County website about existing toll-free foreclosure assistance hotlines, foreclosure counseling, foreclosure prevention programs, and other resources available for residents facing possible foreclosures.	Complete	Foreclosure resources and links are provided on the Placer County home page.	Retain program			
B-15	To facilitate construction of high-density housing on commercially-zoned sites, the County shall consider amending the zoning ordinance provisions for multi-family housing use. These revisions may include amending the zoning ordinance to allow multi-family dwellings, 20 or fewer units/acre as a permitted use by right in the C1 and C2 zone districts.	Incomplete	Anticipated to be part of General Plan Update if not a Zoning Text Amendment sooner.	Retain program			
C-1	The County shall continue to work with TRPA to establish a framework for consideration of changes to the TRPA Code of Ordinances that will facilitate the construction of affordable and	Ongoing	Placer County and various Tahoe stakeholder groups are working with TRPA to provide a revised set of incentives in its new 20-year	Retain program			



	Table 70 Evaluation of 2008 Placer County Housing Element Policies					
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation		
	workforce housing.		Regional Plan currently being written. The County is currently working with TRPA to allow second units on parcels less than one-acre in size in the basin. A draft is complete and awaiting TRPA approval.			
C-2	The County shall initiate a review of Policy C-2 to consider specific issues including: The appropriateness of the application of the same requirement to both small (i.e. under 2 acres in project area) commercial/ professional office projects, the financial feasibility of requiring 50 percent of the housing demand and the impact of the requirement on attracting new commercial projects.	Incomplete	This has not been completed. Stakeholders have requested this change to provide relief to small developers/property owners.	Retain program		
C-3	The County will continue to support a legislative platform to facilitate the development of affordable housing, especially in Lake Tahoe and the surrounding Sierra areas.	Ongoing	Placer County and various Tahoe stakeholder groups are working with TRPA to provide a revised set of incentives in its new 20-year Regional Plan currently being written. The County is also updated its Tahoe Basin Community Plans.	Retain program		
C-4	The County shall investigate additional mechanisms to facilitate the production of workforce housing in the Lake Tahoe area. These mechanisms include, but are not limited to, the creation of an assessment district(s) and/or an amnesty period for illegal secondary dwelling units.	Ongoing	The County is working with TRPA to adopt an Affordable Housing Plan that would allow second units on parcels less than one acre in size within the basin. A draft document prepared for TRPA's review, but has not been approved.	Retain program		
C-5	The County shall continue to meet with surrounding jurisdictions in the Tahoe Basin to discuss workforce housing issues and develop cooperative strategies that address identified workforce housing needs.	Ongoing	The County continues to work with various stakeholder groups in the basin and Sierra to address affordable housing issues.	Retain program		
C-6	The County shall work with employers in the Eastern Sierra portion of the county to establish a down payment assistance program in which employers provide deferred mortgages for	Incomplete	This has not been initiated.	Remove program		



	TABLE 70											
	EVALUATION OF 2008 F	LACER COUN	TY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES									
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation								
	workers who wish to purchase existing homes in the Eastern Sierra and are qualified first-time homebuyers. Workers participating in the pilot program shall agree to share the future equity from market appreciation with the employer sponsoring the mortgage.											
D-1	The County will apply annually for CDBG rehabilitation funds to provide housing rehabilitation services and weatherization services to very low and low-income households.	Ongoing	The Housing Authority and Placer County Planning Division track grant application opportunities on a consistent basis.	Retain program								
D-2	The County shall continue to administer the Housing Choice Voucher Program (Section 8 assistance) through the Placer County Housing Authority.	Ongoing	The County has an approximate 91 percent allocation utilization rate. There are 276 vouchers but only 251 are funded.	Retain program, but move to Section B.								
D-3	The County shall consider providing incentives for the preservation of mobile home parks.	Ongoing	Additional incentives to preserve mobile home parks have not been formulated.	Remove program								
E-1	The County shall continually update the list of all dwellings within the unincorporated County that are currently subsidized by government funding or low-income housing developed through local regulations or incentives. The list shall include, at a minimum, the number of units, the type of government assistance, and the date at which the units may convert to market- rate dwellings. The Redevelopment Agency shall act as a clearinghouse for information regarding the promotion and maintenance of government subsidized low-income housing.	Ongoing	The Placer County Planning Division maintains a list of units produced through state and federal programs and monitors their affordability covenants.	Retain program								
E-2	The County shall include in all existing and new incentive or regulatory program requirements to give notice prior to the conversion of any deed-restricted affordable units to market-rate units as described in Policy E-2.	Ongoing	The Placer County Planning Division continues to work with appropriate organizations to identify units which may convert to market-rate.	Retain program								
E-3	To maintain and improve the existing supply of affordable rental housing, the County shall work with local public agencies, public and private non-profit organizations, and forprofit corporations with the legal and managerial capacity to	As-Needed	The Placer County Planning Division continues to work with appropriate organizations to identify units which may convert to market-rate.	Retain program								



		TABLE 7		
	EVALUATION OF 2008 F	PLACER COUNT	TY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES	
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation
	acquire and manage at-risk affordable properties. The County shall work with property owners and the identified agencies and organizations to ensure continued affordability of subsidized units, and shall provide technical and financial assistance for the acquisition and rehabilitation of at-risk properties.			
F-1	The County shall evaluate increasing the by-right occupancy of small group housing developments and residential care facilities from group homes with six or fewer residents to group homes with eight or fewer residents in all residential zones subject to the same rules that apply to single-family dwellings.	Complete	Amendment adopted 2011.	Remove program
F-2	The County shall consider requiring developers to offer a "universal design package" as an option to homebuyers. The County shall determine the most appropriate application of the ordinance, such as the size of residential projects and the type of residential dwellings that will be subject to the ordinance.	Incomplete	This requirement has not been adopted. The County will continue to encourage incorporation of universal design features in new structures.	Remove program
F-3	The County shall review the Zoning Ordinance, land use policies, permitting practices, and building codes to identify provisions that could pose constraints to the development of housing for persons with disabilities, and amend the documents, as needed, for compliance with Federal and State fair housing laws.	Ongoing	Ordinances and policies are amended as necessary to maintain consistency with State law.	Retain program
F-4	The County shall amend the zoning ordinance to ensure that permit processing procedures for farmworker housing do not conflict with Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6 which states that "Any employee housing consisting of no more than 36 beds in a group quarters or 12 units or spaces designed for use by a single family or household shall be deemed an agricultural land use designation for the purposes of this section. For the purpose of all local ordinances, employee housing shall not be deemed a use that implies that the employee housing is	Complete	Zoning Text Amendment adopted by Board of Supervisors on November 6, 2012	Remove program



	Table 70											
	EVALUATION OF 2008 F	PLACER COUN	TY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES									
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation								
	an activity that differs in any other way from an agricultural use. No conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of this employee housing that is not required of any other agricultural activity in the same zone." The County shall also ensure that such procedures encourage and facilitate the development of housing for farmworkers.											
G-1	The County shall continue to support emergency shelter programs, including consideration of funding for programs developed through inter-jurisdictional cooperation.	Ongoing	The homeless shelter is run by a non-profit group, the "Gathering Inn." This group operates a nomadic shelter in which the homeless shelter location moves from church site to church site.	Retain program								
G-2	The County shall continue to provide transitional and permanent supportive housing in the form of group housing. Additionally, the County shall identify sites for use as transitional and permanent supportive housing to address the unmet need for these services.	Complete	Adopted by Board of Supervisors, 2011.	Remove program								
G-3	The County shall amend the Zoning Ordinance to include emergency and transitional housing as an allowed land use in certain zoning districts.	Complete	Adopted by Board of Supervisors, 2011.	Remove program								
G-4	The County shall amend the Zoning Code to define Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units and explicitly allows SROs as a residential use in certain zones. These zones could include the Multi-Family Residential (RM), Highway Service (HS), and Resort (RES) zoning districts.	Complete	Zoning Text Amendment passed by Planning Commission in December 2012. Anticipated for adoption early 2013.	Remove program								
H-1	The County shall provide information to the public regarding the efficient use of energy in the home and ways to improve the energy efficiency of new construction. The County shall promote this program by posting information on their web page and creating a handout to be distributed with land development applications.	Ongoing	The County has several handouts that are distributed when a Building Permit is issued. Web update forthcoming.	Retain program								
H-2	The County shall encourage efficient energy use in new	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy.	Retain program								



	Table 70											
	EVALUATION OF 2008 F	LACER COUN	TY HOUSING ELEMENT POLICIES									
	Policies	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation								
	development, such as compact urban form, access to non-auto transit, use of traffic demand management, water-efficient landscaping, among other possibilities. The County shall promote this program by incorporating policies that encourage efficient energy use into new and updated land use plans.		If funding is secured, the County will prepare a Climate Action Plan in 2013.									
H-3	The County shall develop a green building incentive program to promote the provision of green building practices in new residential development. The "green incentive" program shall establish a point system that rates new residential development by assigning value to certain green building practices.	Incomplete	This has not been completed.	Delete program. No longer needed with the adoption of CalGreen.								
H-4	The County shall continue to implement provisions of the Subdivision Map Act that require subdivisions to be oriented for solar access, to the extent practical.	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy.	Retain program								
I-1	The County shall continue to be the local contact point for the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, and provide resource and referral information regarding housing and tenant rights through brochures available at the Housing Authority, the Placer County Library, and other local social services offices. In addition, the County shall post this information on the County website.	Ongoing	Equal access to housing is protected by State and Federal law. Placer County promotes fair housing opportunities through its various financial assistance initiatives and affordable housing/neighborhood revitalization programs. HHS Community Services and Housing Authority's efforts include educating the community about fair housing and equal housing opportunity, providing housing counseling services and family resource information and referral.	Retain program								
I-2	Since Placer County does not have a fair employment and housing board, the County shall refer people who suspect discrimination in housing to Legal Services of Northern California.	Ongoing	This is and has consistently been County policy.	This is policy language. Include as a policy.								
J-1	The County shall name a housing coordinator/point-person to oversee the implementation of Housing Element policies and	Ongoing	This function has been assigned to the Planning Division's Long-Range Planning Team. A	Modify program								



	Table 70 Evaluation of 2008 Placer County Housing Element Policies											
Policies	es	Status	Evaluation	Recommendation								
	ms, facilitate permit processing of affordable housing		Housing Specialist was added to the Planning									
develop	pments and oversee workforce housing programs.		Division after the Redevelopment Agency was									
T. 2	. 1 11 . 11 1		dissolved in February 2012.	D. C.								
	bounty shall establish an inter-departmental housing	Ongoing	Housing program implementation is coordinated	Retain program								
	ittee/working group to ensure that the Planning		through the Community Development Resources									
	tment, Health and Human Services, and the elopment Agency continue to work together in all aspects		Agency.									
	sing production in order to ensure that housing policies											
	ograms are implemented as efficiently and effectively as											
	le, and to ensure that funding is judiciously managed.											
	nterdepartmental coordination could include periodic											
	gs with the Chief Executive Officer, and an annual											
	nop with the Board of Supervisors.											
J-3 The Co	ounty shall review the Redevelopment Agency Project	Discontinued	The Redevelopment Agency was dissolved in	Remove program								
Areas H	Housing Production Plan to determine consistency with		February 2012.									
this upd	dated Housing Element.											

Source: Placer County, 2012.



### REFERENCES

### Persons Consulted

Denton, Kathie, LCSW. Placer County Department of Health and Human Services, Auburn, CA. August 1, 2012.

Ken Sibley, Placer County Building Division, August 22, 2012.

Paul Thompson, Deputy Director of Planning, September 13, 2012.

### Websites

California Department of Housing and Community Development. <a href="http://www.hcd.ca.gov">http://www.hcd.ca.gov</a>. November 2007.

United States Census Bureau. <a href="http://www.census.gov">http://www.census.gov</a>. August 2007.

California Employment Development Department. <a href="http://edd.ca.gov">http://edd.ca.gov</a>. August 2007.

United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis <a href="http://www.bea.gov">http://www.bea.gov</a>. August 2007.

Sacramento Regional Research Institute (SRRI). <a href="http://www.srri.net">http://www.srri.net</a>. August 2007.

California Department of Finance. <a href="http://www.dof.ca.gov">http://www.dof.ca.gov</a>. August 2007.

United States Social Security Administration. http://www.ssa.gov. August 2007.

Placer County Association of Realtors, Inc. <a href="http://www.pcaor.com">http://www.pcaor.com</a>. August 2007.

Placer County Water Agency. <a href="http://www.pcwa.net">http://www.pcwa.net</a>. August 2007.

### Reports and Documents

California Community Redevelopment Law, Section 33413.

California Department of Housing and Community Development, Division of Housing Policy Development. *Memorandum: Official State Income Limits for 2007*. April 18, 2007. <a href="http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/state/inc2k7.pdf">http://www.hcd.ca.gov/hpd/hrc/rep/state/inc2k7.pdf</a>.

Connerly & Associates, Inc. Placer County Affordable Housing Strategy.

Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2005 Continuum of Care Homeless Assistance Programs, Housing Activity Chart Report. 2005.



Sacramento Regional Research Institute. *Placer County Economic and Demographic Profile 2007*. January 2007. <a href="http://www.srri.net/AboutUs/Placer\_2007.pdf">http://www.srri.net/AboutUs/Placer\_2007.pdf</a>.

Placer County Mental Health Services Act. "Plan for Community Services and Supports." November 2006.

Placer County Planning Department. Zoning Ordinance. 2007.

Placer County Redevelopment Agency. North Auburn Redevelopment Project Area Five-Year Implementation Plan 2007-2012, May 2007.

Placer County Redevelopment Agency. Sunset Industrial Redevelopment Project Area Five-Year Implementation Strategy 2007-2012, May 2007.

Placer County Redevelopment Agency. North Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Project Area Five-Year Implementation Strategy 2006-2011, April 2006.

Placer County Redevelopment Agency. Sheridan Housing Conditions Survey, January 2003.

Placer County Redevelopment Agency. Community Needs Assessment for Foresthill Divide, January 2003.

PMC, Placer County Redevelopment Agency. Affordable Housing Development Incentive Study, August 2007.

Placer County Water Agency. Integrated Water Resources Plan, August 2006.

Southern California Association of Non-Profit Housing. *Parking Requirements Guide for Affordable Housing Developers*. February 2004.

Bender Rosenthal, Inc., Report on Property Value Ranges – Placer County Conservation Plan, April 2011.

Sacramento Business Journal, Signs of Recovery in New-Home Market. May 11, 2012.

Sacramento Business Journal, Westpark Adds to Roseville Holdings. September 23, 2010.

Sacramento Business Journal, Homebuilders Warm Up to Placer Land. August 13, 2009.

### GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT



This page is intentionally left blank.



### **APPENDIX A: RESIDENTIAL LAND INVENTORY**

### GENERAL PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT



This page intentionally left blank



# TABLE A-1 PLANNED AND APPROVED PROJECTS WITH AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS

# Unincorporated Placer County As of January 1, 2013

				Α	s of Janua	iry 1, 2013							
					Maximum				# of Afford	lable Units			
					Allowable	Planned			Very				
		GP LU			Density	Density			Low-	Low-	Moderate	Description of	
Plan Area/ Project	APN#	Designation	Zoning	Acres	(DU/acre)	(DU/acre)	Number of Units		Income	Income	-Income	Affordable Units	Project Status
<b>Placer County Unit</b>	ncorporated Area							654	40	320	294		
Auburn/Bowman Commi	unity Plan											T	
Gateway Court Village	052-040-075	COMM	CPD-Dc	3.2	21.8	7.9	27	3		3		3	Approved, Unbuilt
												Redevelopment 15	
							18 lot planned					percent affordability	
Hidden Creek	0.51 1.50 0.05	RLDR .9-2.3	DG 4 G D 40 DD 4	40.5			residential		_			requirement. 45-year	
Subdivision	051-120-007	DU/acre	RS-AG-B-40 PD = 1	19.5	1.1	1.1	development	3	1	2		deed restriction	Approved, Unbuilt.
Auburn Alzheimer's												Assisted-living center for 64 residents; units	
Care Center	nartian af 051 190 079	Mixed-Use	OP-RM-Dc	1.6	74.0	40	64	7/0				are special needs	Approved; Unbuilt
Care Center	portion of 051-180-078 051-140-056	Mixed-Use	OP-RIVI-DC	1.6	/4.0	40	04	n/a				78 Rental/Employee	Approved, Onbuilt
	051-140-056											Housing units;	
	051-140-057						858 units: 780					(Employee Housing	
Timberline (formerly	051-180-059	HDR 10-15	RA-AG-B-40 RS-DL-5 RM-				age-restricted, 78					Requirement) 55-	
Harmon Park)	051-211-016	DU/acre	SL-5-Dc PD=8 RM-DL-15	92.9	15.0	na	affordable	78		78		year deed restriction	Approved, Unbuilt
Timemen 1 min)	001 211 010	20,4010	SEC SUID O RAN BE RE	72.7	10.0	110	unionumone	, 0		, 0		3 deed-restricted	ripproved, encum
												affordable units	
Virginian Condos	052-040-080	COMM	CPD-Dc	2.6	21.8	11.8	32	3		3		required.	Approved, Unbuilt
	054-171-031											•	
	054-171-032								29 (very)				
Quartz Ridge Apts.	054-171-035 - 38	MDR5-10	RM-DL10	6.5	10	10	64	64	7 (ext)	13	16		Approved, Unbuilt
<b>Granite Bay Community</b>	Plan												
Premier Granite Bay												market-rate half-plex	
Subdivision	047-060-013,-033	COMM	C-1-UP-DC	8.0	?	6.3	52	52			52		Approved; Unbuilt
												Market-rate	
												townhomes; pricing	
Pardee Court	047-150-042	COMM	CPD-Dc 10	3.57	10	10	35	35			35	TBD	Approved; Unbuilt
Horseshoe Bar/Penryn C	ommunity Plan												
							expand to 124						
							mobile homes						
							from current 101						
Glenbrook Mobile Home	000000	HDR 4-10	D1 D1 10 GD	4.60	100		in mobile home						
Park	036-110-044	DU/acre	RM-DL10-SP	16.2	10.0	7.7	park	23		23		23 (mobile homes)	Approved, Unbuilt
							150 attached					1 1	
Orchard at Penryn	043-060-052 & -053	Penryn Parkway	RM-DL10 PD = 10	15 1	10.0	10.29	condo units in 4 to 5-units bldgs.	150			150	market-rate multi- family; pricing TBD	BOS Hearing Sept. 2012
-		Penryn Parkway	RM-DL10 PD = 10	15.1	10.0	10.28	to 5-units blugs.	130			130	ramily; pricing 1BD	BOS Hearing Sept. 2012
Martis Valley Communit	y Plan	MDD 5 10										F1	
E1	000 000 005 1 1 4	MDR 5-10	DM DD = 10	5	10	10	40	40		40		Employee Housing -	Ammanual Tubuit
Eaglewood/Timilick	080-060-085 – Lot A	DU/acre	RM PD = 10	5	10	10	48	48		48		Apts	Approved, Unbuilt
Englowerd/Timilial-	000 060 005   Lot M	MDR 5-10	DM DD = 9	1	8	o	0	8			0	Employee Housing – THs	Approved Liphwilt
Eaglewood/Timilick	080-060-085 – Lot M	DU/acre	RM PD = 8	I	8	8	8	8			8	1 f1S	Approved, Unbuilt



# TABLE A-1 PLANNED AND APPROVED PROJECTS WITH AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS

**Unincorporated Placer County** 

Northeater Highlands   The						s of Janua		anty						
Pana Area   Project   Pana Area   Project   Pana Area   Pana											lable Units			
Euglish: Ranch   186-064-1881   186-274-025 & 185   138   1.5   11/8   1.5	Plan Area/ Project	APN#		Zoning	Acres	Density	Density	Number of Units	TOTAL	Low-			Affordable Units	Project Status
Northstart Highlands II (10650-039, 4017, 4087, 6067, 110- PP RES-DS PD 15 1245.91 15.0 4 516 32 32 workforce housing Approved, Unbuilt Southwest Placer Substrate Highlands II (10650-039, 4017, 4087, 6067, 110- PP RES-DS PD 15 1245.91 15.0 4 516 32 32 32 workforce housing Approved, Unbuilt Southwest Placer Substrate II (10650-039, 4017, 4018, 401													30 yr. deed restriction on each unit at closing (Employee Housing	
Northeen Highlands   1	Hopkins Ranch	,		RS-B-X 20 AC. MIN. PD = 1.2	282.3	5.0	5	50	35	3	10	22	Requirement)	Approved; 10 units Built
Dec Creek/West Place Community Plan	Northstar Highlands II			RES-DS PD = 15	1245.91	15.0	.4	516	32		32		workforce housing	Approved, Unbuilt
Morgan Piec - PFE   Rod Subdivision   023-221-013   DU'acre   RM-DL-8-DC   119   100   7.3   91   12   12   Market-rate multi-family; Pricing TBD   Approved; Unbuilt   Table Area   Table A	<b>Southwest Placer S</b>	ubarea												
Non-displaying   Non-display		Community Plan	T	,										
Table Area   South   Table Community   Table C		023-221-013		RM-DI-8-DC	11 0	10.0	7.3	01	12			12		Approved: Unbuilt
North Table Community   Fast		023-221-013	Doracic	RW-DL-0-DC	11.7	10.0	1.3	71	12			12	ranniy, i nenig 155	Арргочец, опоши
Cal-New Resort   Gal-New Resort   Gal-		Plan												
PAS 009B Dollar   PAS 009B D	Cal-Neva Resort	000 205 004 015 000 215 022	TOURIST		7.02		210	accommodation	12		12		units; Covenant &	Assessed Tabaile
Tahoe Vista Apts (Sandy Beach Partnership)  117-071-029  Tourist/Comm.  022 Tahoe Vista SA #2: Tourist & 6.2 na 3.6 tourist units and 6 or 7 affordable or 7 a	Highland Village		PAS 009B Dollar					50 duplex units; 78-unit senior housing units					78 senior units, 48 affordable units for low-income seniors; 30-year deed restriction on	
Squaw Valley Specific Plan- Phase One         096-2221-016, others         various         14.7         30-32         26.5         390         TBD         Employee housing – number of units to be determined         EIR Underway           West Shore Community Plan           097-050-072 097-060-022,-024, -031 097-130-034 097-130-034 097-140-003, -033         12 employee housing units; (Employee Housing units; (Employe	Tahoe Vista Apts (Sandy Beach Partnership)		Tourist/Comm.		6.2	na	3.6	campground to 45 tourist units and 6 or 7 affordable	6		6		6-7 units, Deed- Restricted	Approved; Unbuilt
Squaw Valley Specific Plan- Phase One         096-2221-016, others         various         various         14.7         30-32         26.5         390         TBD         number of units to be determined         EIR Underway           West Shore Community Plan           097-050-072 097-060-022,-024, -031 097-130-034 097-130-034 097-140-003, -033         157- Homewood Ski Conservation 4 Planewood CEP Project         157- Homewood Ski Conservation 097-170-013, 097-210-024         244         12         12         12         year deed restriction         Approved, Unbuilt.	Squaw valley Community	y Pian											Employee housing –	
097-050-072	Squaw Valley Specific Plan- Phase One	096-2221-016, others	various	various	14.7	30-32	26.5	390			TBD		number of units to be	EIR Underway
097-060-022,-024, -031	West Shore Community													
	Harris and GERD 2.	097-060-022,-024, -031 097-130-034 097-140-003, -033	CAAW CL CD		101.2	150			10				units; (Employee Housing Requirement); 55-	A
	Kings Beach Community		644 W. Shore GP	Area	101.3	15.0		244	12		12		year deed restriction	Approved, Unbuilt.



### TABLE A-1

### PLANNED AND APPROVED PROJECTS WITH AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS

# Unincorporated Placer County As of January 1, 2013

					S OI Janua	ly I, EUIU							
					Maximum			# of Affordable Units					
					Allowable	Planned			Very				
		GP LU			Density	Density			Low-	Low-	Moderate	Description of	
Plan Area/ Project	APN#	Designation	Zoning	Acres	(DU/acre)	(DU/acre)	Number of Units	TOTAL	Income	Income	-Income	Affordable Units	Project Status
												5 employee housing	
												units; (employee	
												Housing	
	090-071-004; 090-072-002, -024,-		Kings Beach Spec. Area 2: East &									Requirement); 55-	
KB Resorts CEP Project	026,-028,-029,-030	Commercial	West Entry Commercial	1.9			64 rooms	5		5		year deed restriction	Pre-Development Stage
												16 workforce housing	
	090-125-021											units; (Employee	
	090-126-020,-024,-039,-040		Kings Beach Spec. Area 2: East &									Housing	
Kings Beach Town	090-133-003,-005,-006,-007,-008,-		West Entry Commercial and Kings									Requirement); 55-	
Center	009,-010,-011,-012,-015,-016,-018	Comm/Res	Beach Residential	3.9			70	24		24		year deed restriction	Pre-Development State
TOTAL UNITS	·		·					654	40	320	294		



# Table A-2 Inventory of Vacant Parcels with General Plan and Zoning Allowing Higher Density Residential Uses

# Unincorporated Placer County

		_				January 1,	2013					
				Maximum		Maximum Nu	mber of Affo	rdable Units		ied Affordat	ole Units	
		GP LU		Allowable				No alamata	Very		Madausta	
APN#	GP LU Designation	Designation Code	Zoning	Density (DU/acre)	Acres	Very Low- Income	Low- Income	Moderate- Income	Low- Income	Low- Income	Moderate -Income	Notes
	LU Designations/Zoning											
	y General Plan			T				I		T T		
069-020-055-000	High Dens Res. 3500-10000 sf 10-21 DU	HDR10-21	RM-Ds	21.00	2.1	43			37	-	-	
069-020-058-000	High Dens Res. 3500-10000 sf 10-21 DU	HDR10-21	RM-Ds	21.00	8.7	183			156	-		
Auburn/Bown	man Community Plan		1					T		T I		
038-104-085-000	High Density Res. 10 - 15 DU/Ac.	HDR10-15	RM-DL15-Dc	15.00	1.3		19		-	17	-	
038-104-094-000	High Density Residential 10 - 15 DU/Ac.	HDR10-15	RM-DL15-Dc	15.00	1.0		16		-	13		
038-112-059-000	Medium Density Residential 5-10 DU/Ac	MDR5-10	RM-DL10 PD = 10	10.00	3.6			36	-	-	31	Site of withdrawn Sky Villa Apartment project
038-113-031-000	Medium Density Residential 5-10 DU/Ac	MDR5-10	RM-DL10	10.00	1.9			19	-	-	16	
051-120-010-000	Medium Density Residential 5-10 DU/Ac	MDR5-10	RM-DL6	6.00	1.1			6	-	-	5	DeWitt Center- Cottage Drive Parcel
051-180-065-000	Mixed Use	MU	OP-RM-Dc	10.00	1.2			12	-	-	-	No high residential density currently allowed: Airport Overflight Zone
051-180-090-000	Mixed Use	MU	OP-RM-Dc	10.00	14.3			143	-	-	-	No high residential density currently allowed: Airport Overflight Zone
051-180-089-000	Mixed Use	MU	OP-RM-Dc	10.00	1.8			18	-	-	-	No high residential density currently allowed: Airport Overflight Zone
076-092-008-000	Medium Density Residential 5-10 DU/Ac	MDR5-10	RM-DL6-Dc	6.00	2.2			13	-	-	11	Developable, but potential sewer issues
076-112-083-000	High Density Residential 10 - 15 DU/Ac.	HDR10-15	RM-Dc	15.00	13.0		195		-	166	-	Developable, but potential sewer issues
<b>Bickford Ran</b>	ich Specific Plan											
D (D	William Davidsovial	DDCD VD						24			2.4	See Figure 7. Part of Phase I; planned as townhomes at average
R-6B	Village Residential	BRSP-VR BRSP-VR		n/a				24			24	density of 9.9 u/a See Figure 7. Part of Phase I; planned as townhomes at average
R-7B	Village Residential			n/a				18			18	density of 9.9 u/a
R-7C	Village Residential	BRSP-VR		n/a			106			90		See Figure 7. Part of Phase I; planned as affordable senior units; density unknown
K-/C	v mage Kesidendai	BRSP-VR		11/a			100			90		See Figure 7. Part of Phase I; planned as townhomes at average
R-8B	Village Residential			n/a				15			15	density of 9.9 u/a
R-9B	Village Residential	BRSP-VR		n/a				9			0	See Figure 7. Part of Phase I; planned as townhomes at average density of 9.9 u/a
	Community Plan			11/ a				/				density of 7.7 tra
ivial dis valley			RM-B-X 20 AC.									Waddle Ranch property. Not available for residential development -
110-010-023-000	Medium Density Residential 5-10 DU/Ac	MDR5-10	MIN. PD = 10	10.00	38.1			381		-		in conservation.
110-030-068-000	Medium Density Residential 5-10 DU/Ac	MDR5-10	RM-B-X-Ds 20 AC. MIN. PD = 5.8	5.80	42.3			246	_	_	_	Part of Northstar Master Plan; no affordability component
110-050-047-000	Predictin Delisity Residential 3-10 DO/Ac	111110-10		5.80	72.3			240	<u> </u>	-	<u> </u>	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
(portion of	M. I. D. W. D. H. C. L.C. LO. D.W.	MDD 5 10	RM-B-X-Ds 20	5.00	0.2			[				Part of Northstar Master Plan; ; no affordability component; new
parcel)	Medium Density Residential 5-10 DU/Ac	MDR5-10	AC. MIN. $PD = 5.8$	5.80	9.3			54	-	-	-	parcel #: 110-050-061?



# Table A-2 Inventory of Vacant Parcels with General Plan and Zoning Allowing Higher Density Residential Uses

### **Unincorporated Placer County**

						January 1, 2013						
				Maximum		Maximum Nu	umber of Affo	ordable Units	Inventor	ied Afforda	ble Units	
		GP LU		Allowable		Vamelani	Law	Madayata	Very	Law	Madayata	
APN#	GP LU Designation	Designation Code	Zoning	Density (DU/acre)	Acres	Very Low- Income	Low- Income	Moderate- Income	Low- Income	Low- Income	Moderate -Income	Notes
110.050.060.000	Madi na Danais Basidantial 5 10 DU/A	MDD 5 10	RM-B-X-Ds 20	5.00	2.4			10				Det CN determine the plant of the little
110-050-060-000 110-081-029-000	Medium Density Residential 5-10 DU/Ac	MDR5-10	AC. MIN. PD = 5.8	5.80	3.4			19	-	-	-	Part of Northstar Master Plan; no affordability component
(portion of												Part of Northstar Master Plan; no affordability component; adjacent to
parcel)	High Density Residential 10 - 15 DU/Ac.	HDR10-15	RM PD = 15	15.00	1.2		18		-	-	-	Sawmill Heights Project; new parcel #s: 110-081-011-000
Placer Vineya	ards Specific Plan											
022 200 006	W. 1 D D 15 01 DV/4	IIDD	CDI DIICD	2.1		106						Not expected to be developed; Site #1 on Figure 9; Located along East
023-200-006	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac	HDR HDR	SPL-PVSP	21	6	126			-			Dyer Ln. (not part of Core Backbone Infrastructure)  Not expected to be developed; Site #2 on Figure 9; Located along W.
023-200-037	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac	прк	SPL-PVSP	21	7	147			_			Dyer Ln., near Base Line Rd.
023-200-062	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac	HDR	SPL-PVSP	21	5	105			75			Site #3 on Figure 9; Located along Watt Ave.
023-200-015, 028	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac	HDR	SPL-PVSP	21	25	525			375			Site #4 on Figure 9; Located along Watt Ave.
023-200-013, 028	Thigh Density Residential 7-21 DO/Ac	HDR	31 L-1 V 31	21	23	323			313			Site #5 on Figure 9; Located along Watt Ave.  Site #5 on Figure 9; Located along Watt Ave. and off of Base Line
023-200-045, 066	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac		SPL-PVSP	21	46.5	977			698			Rd. near Town Center
023-200-010,		HDR	ant nivan			1.00			120			Give W.C. Trick of the Control of th
012, 013	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac	HDR	SPL-PVSP	21	8	168			120			Site #6 on Figure 9; Located along W. Dyer Ln. and 16 <sup>th</sup> St.
023-200-009	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac		SPL-PVSP	21	10.5	221			158			Site #7 on Figure 9; Located off of Base Line Rd. near Town Center
023-200-067	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac	HDR	SPL-PVSP	21	57	1,197			855			Site #8 on Figure 9; Located in Town Center along 16 <sup>th</sup> St,
023-010-024; 023-200-060	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac	HDR	SPL-PVSP	21	7	147			105			Site #9 on Figure 9; Located along 16 <sup>th</sup> St. near Town Center
023-200-000	High Density Residential 7-21 DO/AC	HDR	SFL-FVSF	21	/	14/			103			Site #9 on Figure 9, Located along to St. ilear Town Center
029; 023-200-008	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac		SPL-PVSP	21	10	210			150			Site #10 on Figure 9; Located along 16 <sup>th</sup> St. near Town Center
023-010-021,		HDR										
022, 023; 023- 150-026, 027;												
023-180-005,												
006, 007, 008	High Density Residential 7-21 DU/Ac		SPL-PVSP	21	23	483			345			Site #11 on Figure 9; Located along W. Dyer Ln. off of Base Line Rd,
<b>Regional Univ</b>	versity Specific Plan											
		MDR										See Figure 8. Inventoried at 11 DU/Ac. (Specific Plan expected
Parcel #5	Medium Density Residential 8-15.9 DU/Ac.	MDD	SPL-RUSP-MDR	15.9	12.8			204			141	density)
Parcel #7	Medium Density Residential 8-15.9 DU/Ac.	MDR	SPL-RUSP-MDR	15.9	17.4			277			191	See Figure 8. Inventoried at 11 DU/Ac. (Specific Plan expected density)
Turcer my	Fredram Bensity Residential 6 13.7 Bensie.	MDR	SI E ROSI MBR	13.5	17.1			211			171	See Figure 8. Inventoried at 11 DU/Ac. (Specific Plan expected
Parcel #10	Medium Density Residential 8-15.9 DU/Ac.		SPL-RUSP-MDR	15.9	28.9			460			318	density)
Damas1 #12	High Density Residential 16-25 DU/Ac.	HDR	SPL-RUSP-HDR	25	16.4	410			295			See Figure 8. Inventoried at 18 DU/Ac. (Specific Plan expected
Parcel #13	High Density Residential 16-25 DU/Ac.	HDR	SPL-RUSP-HDR	25	16.4	410			293			density)  See Figure 8. Part of Phase II; not expected to be available during
Parcel #15	High Density Residential 16-25 DU/Ac.		SPL-RUSP-HDR	25	7.2	180			_			planning period
		HDR										See Figure 8. Part of Phase II; not expected to be available during
Parcel #17	High Density Residential 16-25 DU/Ac.	MDD	SPL-RUSP-HDR	25	5.5	138						planning period
Parcel #18	Medium Density Residential 8-15.9 DU/Ac.	MDR	SPL-RUSP-MDR	15.9	13.6			216			-	See Figure 8. Part of Phase II; not expected to be available during