

Number(s) (APN), Placer County General Plan land use designation, zoning district, maximum allowable density based on the land use designation and zoning, size, number of affordable units (by very low-, low-, and moderate-income categories) based on maximum density, number of affordable units inventoried (by category), and additional notes.

As shown in the table, Placer County has a total inventoried capacity of 5,053 affordable units (~~3,718 very low-, 286 low-, and 1,049 moderate-income~~ 3,974 lower- and 1,079 moderate-income) on vacant sites with residential land use designations and zoning allowing higher density housing; and ~~2,947-2,877~~ affordable units (~~2,947-2,877~~ lower- and 0 moderate-income) on vacant sites with non-residential land use designations and zoning allowing higher density housing.

## **Inventory of Vacant Sites in the Tahoe Basin**

The vacant residential land inventory discussed above did not include an analysis of sites located in the Tahoe Basin. Since development in the Tahoe Basin occurs under a different regulatory framework (for details see Section III(A)(13) (Impediments to Affordable Housing Production in the Tahoe Region) in this document), potential higher-density housing sites are analyzed separately.

Table A-3 (in Appendix A) shows the inventory of sites within the Tahoe Basin that met the following criteria as of January 1, 2013:

- Vacant parcels one acre or larger in size as delineated in TRPA's GIS parcel database and as verified by County staff through aerial photographs and/or field observation.
- In Plan Area Statements (PASs) that allow multi-family dwellings

For each site, the table shows the Assessor's Parcel Number(s) (APN), PAS, size, maximum allowable density, maximum number of affordable units, , number of inventoried affordable units inventoried (by very low-, low-, and moderate-income categories), TRPA incentives that apply to the site, and additional notes.

All of the sites except for one allow a maximum density of 15 units per acre. This is the maximum allowed under current TRPA regulations. These sites were inventoried as available for low-income residential development. The one site with a maximum allowed density of 8 units per acre was inventoried as available for moderate-income residential development.

The inventory uses the following an assumption of 85 percent of maximum buildout capacity for the inventoried unit buildout capacity for all the sites.

As shown in the table, there is a total inventoried capacity in the Tahoe Basin of 408 lower-income units (0 very low-, 393 low-, and 15 moderate-income) on vacant sites.

## ***2. Total Residential Holding Capacity vs. Projected Needs by Housing Type and Income Group***

Table 47 provides a summary of residential holding capacity in Placer County compared its share of the regional housing need for lower income households as assigned in the RHNA. The figures for built and planned projects with an affordability component are from Table A-1 (in Appendix A). The figures for residential holding capacity on vacant land with residential and non-residential designations are from Table A-2 (in Appendix A). The figures for residential holding capacity on vacant land in the Tahoe Basin are from Table A-3 (in Appendix A).

As shown in the table, Placer County has a total residential capacity (~~9,062~~ 8,992) in excess of its RHNA for affordable units (3,258). Additionally, Placer County has sufficient capacity for above moderate-income (market rate) housing to meet its RHNA numbers. However, as described previously, a complete inventory of all vacant residential land within unincorporated Placer County was not conducted.

**TABLE 47**  
**AFFORDABLE RESIDENTIAL HOLDING CAPACITY COMPARED TO RHNA BY INCOME**

**Unincorporated Placer County**  
**January 1, 2013 to October 31, 2021**

	Very Low	Low	Moderate	TOTAL AFFORDABLE
<b>RHNA</b>	1,365	957	936	3,258
<b>Affordable Residential Holding Capacity</b>	<del>6,705-999</del> <u>7,604</u>		<del>1,358-1,388</del>	<del>9,062</del> <u>8,992</u>
Approved and Planned Projects with an Affordability Component (see Table A-1)		<del>40-320</del> <u>360</u>	294	654
Residential Holding Capacity on Vacant Land w/ Residential Designations (see Table A-2)		<del>3,718-286</del> <u>3,974</u>	<del>1,049</del> <u>1,079</u>	5,053
Residential Holding Capacity on Vacant Land w/ Non-Residential Designations (see Table A-2)		<del>2,947-0</del> <u>2,877</u>	0	<del>2,947-0</del> <u>2,877</u>
Residential Holding Capacity on Vacant Land in Tahoe Basin (see Table A-3)		393	15	408

Source: Placer County, TRPA. Mintier Harnish, 2013.

### ***3. Land Available for a Variety of Housing Types***

State Housing Element Law (Government Code Section 65583(c)(1) and 65583.2(c)) requires that local governments analyze the availability of sites that will “facilitate and encourage the development of a variety of types of housing for all income levels, including multifamily rental housing, factory-built housing, mobile homes, housing for agricultural employees, supportive housing, single-room occupancy units, emergency shelters, and transitional housing.”

This section discusses the availability of sites and relevant regulations that govern the development of the types of housing listed above and also discusses sites suitable for redevelopment for residential use (as required by Government Code Section 65583(a)(3)) and second units.

#### **Multi-Family Rental Housing**

Placer County’s High Density Residential (HDR) land use designation and the compatible Multi-Family Residential (RM) zoning district allow multi-family housing up to 21 units per acre in density (more with density bonuses). Placer County regulations make no distinction between rental and ownership housing.

It is County policy that high-density residential projects should be located only in areas where the infrastructure can support this type of use and such that an array of services and employment opportunities are within close proximity. Allowable maximum density varies amongst the County’s 17 community plans to maintain the scale and general character of the specific geographic areas within the unincorporated county.

## Manufactured Housing

Manufactured housing can serve as an alternative form of affordable housing in low-density areas where the development of higher density multi-family residential units is not allowed. Placer County's Zoning Ordinance states that mobile homes are allowed, with zoning clearance, in all zones that allow single-family dwellings, and the same permitting process for single family homes applies to mobile homes. In addition, the Zoning Ordinance allows mobile home parks in multi-family residential, neighborhood commercial, and general commercial zones. Placer County meets all State requirements for allowing the development of manufactured units.

### *Manufactured Homes on Lots*

Sections 65852.3 and 65852.4 of the California Government Code specify that a jurisdiction shall allow the installation of manufactured homes on a foundation on all "lots zoned for conventional single-family residential dwellings." Except for architectural requirements, the jurisdiction is only allowed to "subject the manufactured home and the lot on which it is placed to the same development standards to which a conventional single-family residential dwelling on the same lot would be subject." The architectural requirements are limited to roof overhang, roofing material, and siding material.

The only two exceptions that local jurisdiction are allowed to make to the manufactured home siting provisions are if: 1) there is more than 10 years difference between the date of manufacture of the manufactured home and the date of the application for the issuance of an installation permit; or 2) if the site is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and regulated by a legislative body pursuant to Government Code Section 37361.

Section 17.56.150 of the Placer County Zoning Ordinance states that mobile homes are considered "manufactured homes" and can be placed in all zones allowing single-family residential units when they meet the following criteria:

- Be certified under the National Manufacturing Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974;
- Be placed on a permanent foundation system;
- Have siding materials, roofing materials, and roof overhangs which are consistent with similarly constructed homes in the vicinity when located in Single-family Residential (RS), Multi-family Residential (RM), Resort (RES), and Motel (MT) districts.

Mobile homes that do not meet these criteria can only be placed in Agricultural Exclusive (AE), Farm (F), Agricultural Residential (RA), and Forest Residential (RF) districts on lots that are 10 acres or larger. Mobile homes are permitted with Zoning Clearance (C) in all residential districts, the Motel (MT) district, the Resort (RES) district, the Agricultural Exclusive (AE) district, and the Farm (F) district. The number of mobile homes that may be placed on a single parcel is the same as the number of single-family units allowed.

### *Mobile Home Parks*

Section 69852.7 of the California Government Code specifies that mobile home parks shall be a permitted use on "all land planned and zoned for residential land use." However, local jurisdictions are allowed to require use permits for mobile home parks.

The Placer County Zoning Ordinance allows mobile home parks in multi-family residential, neighborhood commercial, and general commercial zones, with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The Zoning Ordinance allows a maximum of eight spaces per acre.

## **Housing for Employees**

Caretaker and employee housing (excluding farmworker housing) is permanent or temporary housing that is secondary or accessory to the primary use of the property. Such dwellings are used for housing a caretaker employed on the site of a nonresidential use where a caretaker is needed for security purposes, or to provide twenty-four hour care or monitoring, or where work is located at remote locations.

Caretaker and employee housing is allowed in Placer County with either a Zoning Clearance (C) or Minor Use Permit (MUP) in all zoning districts, except the residential districts (RS, RM, RA, and RF), Open Space (O), and Water Influence (W) zones. No more than one caretaker or employee housing unit is allowed for any principle use, except in the case of temporary employee housing or if authorized by the Planning Commission based on specific findings that support the necessity for the number of units approved.

### ***Housing for Agricultural Employees (Permanent and Seasonal)***

The provisions of Section 17020 (*et seq.*) of the California Health and Safety Code relating to employee housing and labor camps supersede any ordinance or regulations enacted by local governments. Such housing is allowed in all jurisdictions in California pursuant to the regulations set forth in Section 17020. Section 17021.5(b) states, for example:

“Any employee housing providing accommodations for six or fewer employees shall be deemed a single-family structure with a residential land use designation for the purposes of this section. For the purpose of all local ordinances, employee housing shall not be included within the definition of a boarding house, rooming house, hotel, dormitory, or other similar term that implies that the employee housing is a business run for profit or differs in any other way from a family dwelling. No conditional use permit, zoning variance, or other zoning clearance shall be required of employee housing that serves six or fewer employees that is not required of a family dwelling of the same type in the same zone.”

Section 17021.6, concerning farmworker housing, states that:

“no conditional use permit, zoning variance; or other zoning clearance shall be required of employee housing that serves 12 or fewer employees and is not required of any other agricultural activity in the same zone.”

Program F-4 in the 2008-2013 Housing Element committed the County to amending its Zoning Ordinance to ensure that permit processing procedures for farmworker housing do not conflict with Health and Safety Code Section 17021.6. The Placer County Board of Supervisors amended the Zoning Ordinance on November 6, 2012 to define Agricultural (Farm) Employees, Farmworker Dwelling Units, and Farmworker Housing Complexes and to permit them in six zone districts that allow farm uses.

Farmworker labor housing is an allowed use in the Agricultural Exclusive (AE), Farm (F), Residential Farm (RF), Forestry (FOR), Timberland Protection Zone (TPZ), and Residential Agricultural (RA) zoning districts.

## **Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, Supportive Housing, and Other Group Living**

SB 2, passed in 2007 and in effect as of January 1, 2008, amended State Housing Element Law (California Government Code Sections 65582, 65583, and 65589.5) regarding shelter for homeless persons. This legislation requires local jurisdictions to strengthen provisions for addressing the housing needs of homeless persons, including the identification of a zone or zones where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without a conditional use permit.

While SB2 added specific new requirements for local governments to meet in terms of planning for emergency shelter facilities, Government Code Section 65583(a)(5) also states that “transitional housing and supportive housing shall be considered a residential use of property, and shall be subject only to those restrictions that apply to other residential dwellings of the same type in the same zone.”

### ***Emergency Shelters***

California Health and Safety Code Section 50801(e) defines “emergency shelters” as:

“housing with minimal supportive services for homeless persons that is limited to occupancy of six months or less by a homeless person. No individual or household may be denied emergency shelter because of an inability to pay.”

The new legislation added provisions to State Housing Element Law (Section 65583(a)(4)(A)) that require local governments to identify:

“a zone or zones where emergency shelters are allowed as a permitted use without a conditional use or other discretionary permit. The identified zone or zones shall include sufficient capacity to accommodate the need for emergency shelter identified in paragraph (7), except that each local government shall identify a zone or zones that can accommodate at least one year-round emergency shelter. If the local government cannot identify a zone or zones with sufficient capacity, the local government shall include a program to amend its zoning ordinance to meet the requirements of this paragraph within one year of the adoption of the housing element. The local government may identify additional zones where emergency shelters are permitted with a conditional use permit. The local government shall also demonstrate that existing or proposed permit processing, development, and management standards are objective and encourage and facilitate the development of, or conversion to, emergency shelters.”

The provisions go on to discuss that emergency shelters “may only be subject to those development and management standards that apply to residential or commercial development within the same zone” along with a list of exceptions that may be made.

The Placer County Board of Supervisors amended the Zoning Ordinance on June 21, 2011 to define Emergency Shelters and designate the zone districts in which they are allowed. Emergency Shelters with 60 or fewer beds are allowed with a Zoning Clearance (C) in the Residential Multi-Family (RM) district. A Minor Use Permit (MUP) is required for shelters with 61 or more beds in the RM district. The vacant sites inventory identifies approximately 148 acres of vacant RM-zoned land. Most RM-zoned land is located near services, such as transit.

Shelters of any size within the Neighborhood Commercial (C1), Highway Service (HS) and Resort (RES) districts require a MUP. In the General Commercial (C2) and Commercial Planned Development (CPD)

districts, all shelters require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). Development standards have been established that do not constrain the development of Emergency Shelters.

There is also an existing emergency shelter programs that operates seasonally and rotates among multiple facilities. The County partners with the Gathering Inn, a non-profit, faith-based ministry providing physical, mental and spiritual restoration for homeless men, women and children in Placer County, thereby helping them to overcome the problems contributing to their homelessness. The center provides case management services allowing the guests to overcome the issues that caused their homelessness. The Gathering Inn serves up to 50 people each night from November 15<sup>th</sup> through March 13<sup>th</sup>. The site of the hosting church changes from one night to the next.

### ***Transitional Housing***

Transitional housing is designed to assist homeless individuals and families in moving beyond emergency shelter to permanent housing. California Health and Safety Code Section 50675.2(h) defines “transitional housing” and “transitional housing development” as:

“buildings configured as rental housing developments, but operated under program requirements that call for the termination of assistance and recirculation of the assisted unit to another eligible program recipient at some predetermined future point in time, which shall be no less than six months.”

In Placer County regulations, for transitional housing facilities that do not involve group living, location of the facilities is subject to the same land use regulations as other housing developments of similar type, size, and density.

The Placer County Board of Supervisors amended the Zoning Ordinance on June 21, 2011 to define group living Transitional Housing and designate the zone districts in which they are allowed. The Zoning Ordinance defines “transitional housing” as “a facility or use that provides housing accommodations and support services for persons and families, but restricts occupancy to no more that twenty-four (24) months. Support services may include meals, counseling, and other services, as well as common areas for residents of the facility. Transitional housing shall be considered a residential use and only subject to those restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.” Transitional Housing with 60 or fewer beds are allowed with a Zoning Clearance (C) in the Residential Multi-Family (RM) district. A Minor Use Permit (MUP) is required for Transitional Housing facilities with 61 or more beds in the RM district. ~~The vacantsites inventory identifies approximately 148 acres of vacant RM-zoned land. Most RM-zoned land is located near services, such as transit.~~

Transitional Housing facilities of any size within the Neighborhood Commercial (C1), Highway Service (HS) and Resort (RES) districts require a MUP. In the General Commercial (C2) and Commercial Planned Development (CPD) districts, all facilities require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). While the definition of transitional housing Zoning Ordinance complies with State law, the provisions dictating where transitional housing need to be updated for consistency with State law. Program F-8 addresses this need.

The County has made transitional housing a priority and has been actively pursuing the provision of such housing opportunities in conjunction with non-profit agencies. Placer County’s Ten-Year Plan to End Homelessness exceeds the federal challenge to end chronic homelessness by encompassing families, youth, and others who may be transitional or chronically homeless. The Plan recognizes the need to eliminate homelessness rather than just managing it. A focus has been placed on preventing homelessness through a variety of means including the provision of affordable housing and appropriate

services. Transitional housing programs that provide temporary housing for homeless persons up to two years with intensive support services will be maintained and expanded.

### ***Supportive Housing***

California Health and Safety Code Section 53260© defines “supportive housing” as:

“housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, and that is linked to onsite or offsite services that assist the tenant to retain the housing, improve his or her health status, maximize their ability to live and, when possible, to work in the community. This housing may include apartments, single-room occupancy residences, or single-family homes.”

Section 53260(d) defines the “target population” for transitional housing as:

“adults with low incomes having one or more disabilities, including mental illness, HIV or AIDS, substance abuse, or other chronic health conditions, or individuals eligible for services provided under the Lanterman Developmental Disabilities Services Act (Division 4.5 (commencing with Section 4500) of the Welfare and Institutions Code) and may, among other populations, include families with children, elderly persons, young adults aging out of the foster care system, individuals exiting from institutional settings, veterans, or homeless people.”

Section 5116 (“Zoning Preemption”) of the California Welfare and Institutions Code (Zoning of Homes or Facilities for Mentally Disordered, Handicapped Persons, or Dependent and Neglected Children) states:

“Pursuant to the policy stated in Section 5115, a state-authorized, certified, or licensed family care home, foster home, or group home serving six or fewer mentally disordered or otherwise handicapped persons or dependent and neglected children, shall be considered a residential use of property for the purposes of zoning if such homes provide care on a 24-hour-a-day basis. Such homes shall be a permitted use in all residential zones, including, but not limited to, residential zones for single-family dwelling.”

Based on this State zoning preemption, supportive housing facilities that involve group living are a permitted use in all residential zones.

The Placer County Board of Supervisors amended the Zoning Ordinance on June 21, 2011 to define group living Supportive Housing and designate the zone districts that they are allowed. The Zoning Ordinance defines “supportive housing” as “a facility or use that provides housing with no limit on length of stay, that is occupied by the target population, as defined by Section 53260(d) of the California Health and Safety Code, and that is linked to on-site or off-site services that assist the tenant to retain the housing, improve his or her health status, maximize their ability to live and, when possible, to work in the community. Supportive housing shall be considered a residential use and only subject to those restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.” Supporting Housing with 60 or fewer beds are allowed with a Zoning Clearance (C) in the Residential Multi-Family (RM) district. A Minor Use Permit (MUP) is required for Supportive Housing facilities with 61 or more beds in the RM district. The vacant sites inventory identifies approximately 148 acres of vacant RM-zoned land. Most RM-zoned land is located near services, such as transit. Supportive Housing facilities of any size within the Neighborhood Commercial (C1), Highway Service (HS) and Resort (RES) districts require a MUP. In the General Commercial (C2) and Commercial Planned Development (CPD) districts, all facilities require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). While the definition of supportive housing Zoning Ordinance

complies with State law, the provisions dictating where supportive housing need to be updated for consistency with State law. Program F-8 addresses this need.

Placer County continues to provide technical assistance to individuals and organizations on housing development, rehabilitation and accessibility of all housing types, including enriched affordable housing, permanent supportive housing, and other housing types for special needs populations.

## Second Units

A second dwelling unit is an additional self-contained living unit, either attached to, or detached from, the primary residential unit on a single lot. It has cooking, eating, sleeping, and full sanitation facilities. Second dwelling units can be an important source of affordable housing since they can be constructed relatively cheaply and have no associated land costs. Second dwelling units can also provide supplemental income to the homeowner, allowing the elderly to remain in their homes or moderate-income families to afford houses.

To encourage establishment of second dwelling units on existing developed lots, State law requires cities and counties to either adopt an ordinance based on standards set out in the law authorizing creation of second dwelling units in residentially-zoned areas, or where no ordinance has been adopted, to allow second dwelling units on lots zoned for single family or multi-family use that contain an existing single family unit subject to ministerial approval ("by right") if they meet standards set out by law. Local governments are precluded from totally prohibiting second dwelling units in residentially-zoned areas unless they make specific findings (Government Code, Section 65852.2).

The Placer County Zoning Ordinance establishes standards for secondary dwelling units that comply with State law. Secondary dwelling units are permitted with an Administrative Review Permit (ARP) in all residential districts, the Resort (RES) district, the Agricultural Exclusive (AE) district, and the Farm (F) district subject to the following standards:

- The lot contains an existing single-family dwelling;
- If construction of a secondary unit is proposed on a vacant lot, elevations and floor plans for both the main unit and the secondary unit must be submitted for approval, along with a representative photograph of the main unit;
- In zoning districts where the minimum lot area is 10,000 square feet or less, the minimum lot area for the lot containing the secondary unit shall be 150 percent the minimum lot area for that specific zoning district;
- Secondary dwellings on parcels smaller than one acre in size shall either be attached to the primary unit or integrated with a detached accessory building (such as a garage);
- The maximum floor area allowed for a secondary dwelling shall be based on the area of the lot as shown in Table 48 below.
- The secondary dwelling shall be architecturally compatible with the primary residence. For attached units, the appearance of the building shall remain that of a single-family residence; and
- A secondary dwelling of 640 square feet or less shall be provided one off-street parking space; a larger secondary dwelling shall be provided two spaces.

**TABLE 48  
MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA ALLOWED FOR  
SECOND UNITS**

**Placer County  
2007**

Lot Area of Site	Maximum Floor Area (sq. ft.)
Less than 1 acre	640
1 acre to 2.29 acres	840
2.3 to 4.59 acres	1,000
4.6 acres or more	1,200

*Source: Placer County Zoning Ordinance, Section 17.56.200*

In the Tahoe Basin, the Placer County Zoning Ordinance applies the same standards to the construction of secondary units with the following distinctions (Zoning Ordinance Section 17.56.202):

- The minimum lot area required to allow a secondary dwelling under this section is ten thousand (10,000) square feet.
- The maximum floor area allowed for a secondary dwelling shall be based on the area of the lot as shown in Table 49 below.
- A second unit of 840 square feet or less shall be provided one off-street parking space; a larger second unit shall be provided two spaces.

**TABLE 49  
MAXIMUM FLOOR AREA ALLOWED FOR  
SECOND UNITS**

**Tahoe Basin Portion of Placer County  
2007**

Lot Area of Site	Maximum Floor Area (sq. ft.)
10,000 sq. ft. to 2.29 acres	840
2.3 to 4.99 acres	1,000
5 acres or more	1,200

*Source: Placer County Zoning Ordinance, Section 17.56.202*

While the County's Zoning Ordinance establishes standards for second units in the Tahoe Basin, TRPA's regulations regarding second units supersede the County's regulations. TRPA limits the construction of second units to lots larger than one acre. Further, a second unit is considered a residential unit, and is therefore subject to the same residential allocation limitations and transfer provisions. Prior to construction of a second unit, the developer must obtain a building allocation from TRPA, unless the second unit is deed-restricted affordable housing. In many cases, the TRPA Code restricts second units to a greater extent than what State law allows. This poses an "actual constraint" for Placer County in its ability to meet the requirements of State law since TRPA regulations that further the realization of the TRPA Regional Plan can preempt State law.

Placer County has a strong interest in permitting secondary units on parcels less than one acre in size within the Tahoe Basin. The Placer County Board of Supervisors has found that establishment and

operation of secondary dwellings in the Basin are necessary in order to implement Section 65852.2 of the California Government Code that will increase the availability of affordable housing in Placer County.

In early 2012, documentation was submitted to the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency to certify Placer County's local government housing program. Complying with TRPA Code Section 18.2.B(2) is required prior to entering into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between TRPA and the County to allow secondary units on parcels less than one acre in size. As required by TRPA, each secondary dwelling unit on parcels less than one acre in size would be restricted to affordable housing. The maximum floor areas for the second units on parcels less than one acre in size would be 840 square feet. TRPA is currently reviewing the draft MOU and zoning text changes necessary to allow the secondary dwelling units on the smaller parcels.

In 2010, 20 building permits were issued for the development of second units in Placer County. In 2011, 24 permits for second units were issued.

### **Sites Suitable for Redevelopment for Residential Use**

An Affordable Housing Development Incentive Study (2007) by PMC for the former Placer County Redevelopment Agency focused on identifying potential incentives and locations for the development of affordable housing on infill sites throughout the County's unincorporated areas. The study, funded by a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) technical assistance grant to guide infill implementation strategies, identified four ideal sites for the implementation of an infill affordable housing incentives ordinance. Using criteria of: site size; proximity to transit, services, and schools; and current zoning that allows residential uses by right or with a minor or conditional use permit; the study identified the following sites (not a comprehensive list of appropriate infill sites):

- North Auburn, 2.61 acre site near Virginian Apartments and Gateway Court (Virginian Condo project has been approved for this site- 32 units);
- North Auburn, 1.86 acre site at the corner of Gateway Court and Plaza Way;
- North Auburn, 1.86 acre site located at 11815 Edgewood Road; and,
- Granite Bay, 3.7 acre site located on Douglas, east of Auburn-Folsom Road (Premier Granite Bay subdivision project proposed for this site- 52 halfplex units).

In addition, it recommended four sites that are not suitable for an infill ordinance, but may still be appropriate for affordable housing development and use of the density bonus program:

- Penryn, 9.9 acre site located on Taylor Road southwest of Penryn Road (Orchard at Penryn planned for this site- 150 attached units);
- Granite Bay, 18.1 acre site located at the corner of Auburn-Folsom and Fuller Road;
- Dry Creek, 4.1 acre site at the corner of PFE Road and Watt Avenue (included in the Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan); and,
- North Auburn, 3.3 acre site off Highway 49 south of Ivy Lane.

In 2002, the County received a CDBG Planning and Technical Assistance grant and conducted the Affordable Housing Site Analysis Study. This study developed a database of 37 potential affordable

housing sites in the North Auburn, Granite Bay, Penryn, Dry Creek and Newcastle areas. It also developed a system to identify such sites utilizing the County's Geographic Information System (GIS). This study was completed in 2004.

In 2003, another CDBG Planning and Technical Assistance grant was received to produce the Affordable Housing Site Concept Feasibility Study. This study selected two of the sites identified in the 2004 report and paid to have Stantec Engineering Consultants to perform a site analysis and preliminary affordable housing site plans. The selected sites were a mixed-use commercial and residential site in Granite Bay and the second, an affordable single-family housing site in North Auburn.

Stantec also developed a methodology for analyzing sites to maximize affordability and environmental compatibility. A map showing opportunities and constraints was produced. These studies were completed in 2005.

### **Single-Room Occupancy Units**

While State Housing Element law requires an analysis of the availability of sites for single-room occupancy units, State law does not define single-room occupancy (SRO) housing. California Health and Safety Code Section 50519(a)(1) defines a "residential hotel" as:

"any building containing six or more guestrooms or efficiency units, as defined by Section 17958.1, intended or designed to be used, or which are used, rented, or hired out, to be occupied, or which are occupied, for sleeping purposes by guests, which is also the primary residence of those guests, but does not mean any building containing six or more guestrooms or efficiency units, as defined by Section 17958.1, which is primarily used by transient guests who do not occupy that building as their primary residence."

However, this definition includes include all types of hotels or motels that are primarily used for permanent housing and covers more types of units than single room occupancy hotels.

Health and Safety Code Section 37912(k) states:

"A dwelling unit shall be deemed to be used on a nontransient basis for such purpose if the term of the tenancy is one month or longer or if the tenant has resided in the unit for more than 30 days. In a residential hotel, individual dwelling units shall lack either cooking facilities or individual sanitary facilities, or both. However, for purposes of this subdivision, a residential hotel does not include dormitories, fraternity and sorority houses, hospitals, sanitariums, rest homes, or trailer parks and courts."

The 2009 Housing Element Program G-4 called for the County to amend the Zoning Code to define Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units and explicitly allow 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.

On June 4, 2013, the Placer County Board of Supervisors amended the Zoning Ordinance to define Single Room Occupancy Residential Hotels and to complexes with 30 or fewer units with an Administrative Review Permit (ARP) in the Residential Multi-Family (RM) district. A Minor Use Permit (MUP) is required for complexes with 31 or more units in the RM district and for complexes of any size in the Highway Service (HS) and Resort (RES) districts.

## ***4. Adequacy of Public Facilities, Services, and Infrastructure***

This section addresses the adequacy of public facilities, services, and infrastructure to accommodate planned residential growth through the end of the Housing Element planning period (October 31, 2021). County facilities, services, and infrastructure are generally adequate to accommodate development of vacant residential sites to meet the identified housing need of 5,031 units.

### **Water**

The Placer County Water Agency (PCWA) is the largest supplier of potable and raw water in Placer County. The PCWA provides water for residential and agricultural use to over 220,000 customers throughout the cities and unincorporated communities of western Placer County, with the exception of parts of the cities of Roseville and Lincoln, which are served by municipal water agencies. About 20 percent of the water supplied by PCWA is treated drinking water, and the remaining 80 percent of water is used for irrigation. PCWA operates eight individual treated water systems: Alta, Applegate, Bianchi, Auburn/Bowman, Colfax, Foothill-Sunset, Lahontan, and Monte Vista. Six of the water systems are supplied through water treatment plants that treat surface water supplied via the PCWA canal system. The Bianchi system serves surface water purchased from the City of Roseville, and the Lahontan system is supplied by wells.

Other smaller water suppliers also serve the county. The San Juan Water District (SJWD) serves customers in the Granite Bay area of southwestern Placer County with surface water from Folsom Lake treated at its own water treatment plant. The Nevada Irrigation District (NID) serves approximately 2,457 connections and an estimated population of 5,700 in the north Auburn area. Placer County does provide potable water to the town of Sheridan from public water wells.

According to supply-demand analyses for future water use in Placer County contained in the PCWA 2006 Integrated Water Resources Plan, there is adequate water supply from groundwater, reclaimed water and surface water to meet projected demand for a future population of approximately 622,000 people. Based on DOF and SACOG population projections, the County's population will reach roughly half this size during the Housing Element planning period. PCWA's analyses were based on land use information from general plans and community plans, proposed development projects including Placer Vineyards and Bickford Ranch, as well as SACOG projections of future population and employment growth. PCWA has the capacity to supply surface water to all of the currently planned Specific Plans in unincorporated Placer. Some areas on well water have issues finding adequate water, particularly in the foothills.

### **Sewer**

The Placer County Facility Services Department oversees three sewer maintenance districts: Sewer Maintenance District 1 (SMD 1), located to the north of the City of Auburn near Applegate; Sewer Maintenance District 2 (SMD 2), east of Roseville and Rocklin, bordering the southern boundary of the county; and Sewer Maintenance District 3 (SMD 3), adjacent to SMD 2. The Facility Services Department also operates and maintains five County Service Area zones: Livoti Sanitary Sewer (CSA 28, Zone 55), Blue Canyon Sanitary Sewer (CSA 28, Zone 23), Dry Creek Sanitary Sewer (CSA 28, Zone 173), , Sheridan Sanitary Sewer (CSA 28, Zone 6), and Sunset- Whitney Sanitary Sewer (CSA 28, Zone 2A3)

Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) 1 in Auburn treats wastewater from SMD 1, and WWTP 3 in Loomis serves SMD 3. Two treatment plants in Roseville treat the wastewater from SMD 2 and the five County Service Areas. The community of Sheridan has its own wastewater treatment ponds which have

recently been upgraded. Placer County is pursuing a regional sewer project with the City of Lincoln to treat SMD 1 wastewater at the City of Lincoln WWTP. SMD 1 would then be decommissioned. In addition, a project is moving forward to convey the SMD 3 wastewater to the City of Roseville's regional WWTP. The SMD 3 WWTP would then be taken offline. The South Placer Municipal Utility District serves part of the unincorporated areas of the county, as well as the City of Rocklin and Town of Loomis. Wastewater from this area is treated by the City of Roseville.

The North Tahoe Public Utilities District and the Tahoe City Public Utility District collect and transport wastewater in the Tahoe area. The wastewater is directed outside the Basin to the Truckee Tahoe Sanitation Agency treatment plant.

According to sources at the Placer County Facility Services Department, current (2012) sewer capacity is inadequate in Sewer Maintenance District 1, but Districts 2 and 3 have adequate capacity. In Sheridan, the county historically discharged treated wastewater into Yankee Slough during heavy rains; however, the permit expired necessitating construction of another pond to accommodate the runoff. A building moratorium in Sheridan was in place through 2011 when upgrades to the treatment plan were completed.

## **Infrastructure Financing**

Section 4 of the Placer County General Plan articulates the principle of ensuring the timely development of public facilities and the maintenance of specified service levels for these facilities:

“Where new development requires the construction of new public facilities, the new development shall fund its fair share of the construction. The County shall require dedication of land within newly developing areas for public facilities, where necessary.”

Through the development review process, the County also ensures that adequate public facilities and services are available to serve new development. Therefore, new development must contribute its fair share toward the provision of water, wastewater, electric, parks and recreation, police and fire services, as well as school funding.

## **Summary**

As growth occurs, the capacity of the applicable WWTP and conveyance system are analyzed to verify if there is existing capacity available or if improvements are necessary to serve the growth. Placer County generally has adequate public facilities, services, and infrastructure to accommodate planned residential growth during the timeframe of this Housing Element (to October 31, 2021). These facilities are adequate to meet population growth associated with the development of Placer County's share of the regional housing sites identified in this Housing Element. The County's Public Facility and Services section of the General Plan will not affect the County's ability to accommodate its share of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation.

## **B. Inventory of Local, State, and Federal Housing and Financing Programs**

Placer County has access to a variety of resources available for affordable housing activities. This includes programs from local, State, Federal, and private sources. Due to the high cost of housing project development and the competition for funding sources, it is generally necessary to leverage several funding sources to construct an affordable housing project. The following section describes the most significant housing resources in Placer County.

### ***1. Local Agencies and Programs***

#### **Placer County Housing Successor Entity replaced the former Placer County Redevelopment Agency**

The Placer County Redevelopment Agency was created in 1996 and eliminated on February 1, 2012. Placer County elected to retain the housing assets, functions, and powers previously performed by the redevelopment agency, excluding amounts on deposit in the Low and Moderate Income Housing Fund. As the housing successor entity the County continues to operate its first time homebuyer, owner occupied rehabilitation programs as well as completing the multi-family housing development in Kings Beach and the proposed multi-family housing development in North Auburn.

In 2007, the Redevelopment Agency signed an agreement with Domus Development for \$1,136,500 to assist with redevelopment of up to eight scattered residential sites in Kings Beach for approximately 100 affordable housing units. In February 2008, the Redevelopment Agency Board approved the use of \$3.9 million for the purchase of three parcels in the Domus proposal, and approved an option agreement with Domus for development of the three parcels.

This project was also submitted and subsequently accepted, as one of the five Community Enhancement Program (CEP) Proposals for the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency's (TRPA) Pathway 2007 Plan. Through the CEP, TRPA invited developers to submit proposals for innovative, infill development projects that focused on the revitalization of downtown areas and were oriented around different modes of transit. The focus of the CEP is to encourage revitalization projects in downtown and recreation areas that demonstrate substantial environmental, as well as social and economic benefits. Developers whose projects are selected for the program receive incentives including Commercial Floor Area (CFA), Tourist Accommodation Bonus Units (TABU), and Multi-residential Bonus Units (MRBU). Incentives may also involve easing density limitations and building heights.

Domus Development formed the Kings Beach Housing Associates, LLC, and began construction of 77 multi-family new construction units on five sites in Kings Beach. In 2011, 14 units were completed, with the remaining units completed in 2012.

It is expected that these projects, in turn, will be catalysts for revitalization of Basin community centers, transit nodes and neighborhood centers. Since Community Enhancement Projects are intended to provide clear public benefit, many of the projects are proposing to provide affordable housing units.

### ***Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funds***

The purpose of the CDBG Program is to provide adequate housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities, particularly for persons of low and moderate-income. CDBG funds may be used for a wide range of community development activities serving low-income households, including acquisition/rehabilitation, homebuyer assistance, community facilities, infrastructure in support of new affordable housing, economic development, and neighborhood revitalization. The Placer County unincorporated area, because it is under 120,000 in population, does not qualify as an entitlement jurisdiction to receive CDBG funding directly from HUD; consequently, the County applies for State-administered CDBG program funds, on a competitive basis. At least 70 percent of the State's CDBG grant funds must be used for activities benefitting low- and moderate-income persons over a one-, two-, or three-year time period selected by the State.

Between 1998 and February 2012, the County received approximately \$5.8 million in CDBG funds for housing rehabilitation, public works, economic development, and planning and technical assistance projects.

Placer County applies CDBG funds to preserve the existing stock of affordable housing through the County Housing Rehabilitation Program. This program provides housing rehabilitation and weatherization loans (to a maximum of \$125,000 and services to low-income households throughout the county.

\$42,000 from the 2002 CDBG grant was used to rehabilitate Sierra House, a Lazarus-owned transitional living facility for previously homeless men in unincorporated Roseville. Program income was used to fund a \$100,000 loan for Roseville Home Start, a transitional living facility for homeless individuals in 2005. The National Alliance for the Mentally Ill received a \$94,600 Program Income Loan in 2006 to renovate their facility.

The County also uses CDBG funding for public works projects aimed at low-income households, such as conversions from septic systems to sewers and extensions of public water services.

The Handy Person Program, run by Senior First (a local non-profit corporation specializing in services for seniors in Placer County), provides county funding for home repairs up to \$1,300 for low- and moderate-income seniors who are 65 years or older or individuals with disabilities of any age, living in the unincorporated areas of the county. An average 175 home repairs per year have been assisted through this program since 2003.

### ***Home Investment Partnership Act (HOME Program)***

The HOME Program is a Federal housing program enacted pursuant to Title 11 of the National Affordable Housing Act (1990). The purposes of the HOME Program are to: 1) expand the supply of decent, affordable housing for low and very low-income families, with emphasis on rental housing; 2) increase State and local capacity to carry out affordable housing programs; and 3) provide for coordinated assistance to participants in the development of affordable low-income housing. Although Placer County is not eligible to receive HOME funds directly from HUD, the County can apply to the State for specific HOME program funds. Community Housing Development Organizations (CHODOs) can also apply for HOME funds from the State.

### ***First-Time Homebuyer Program***

The County established a First-Time Homebuyer Program using a \$500,000 HOME grant received in fiscal year 2000, and \$120,000 of Redevelopment set-aside funds. The program assists low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers in Placer County by offering deferred shared-net appreciation loans for the down payment and/or eligible closing costs and fees. Eleven homebuyers were assisted. \$400,000 was dedicated to the program in fiscal year 2003/2004 which funded six loans.

For the 2005/2006 fiscal year, the County received a HOME grant of \$800,000 to make loans of up to \$150,000 to qualified first-time home buyers. Three first-time homebuyer loans were funded with the balance used for housing rehabilitation.

For the 2008/2009 fiscal year, the County received a HOME grant of \$800,000 and funded eight first-time homebuyer loans.

For the 2010/2011 fiscal year, the County received a HOME grant of \$800,000. Due to the reduction in the median sales price of homes in the county, the maximum loan amount has been reduced to \$125,000. The County funded four first-time homebuyer loans and funds remain to assist additional homebuyers or for owner occupied-rehabilitation assistance.

For the 2012/2013 fiscal year, the County will be applying for \$700,000 of HOME funds. The maximum application amount has been reduced from \$800,000 to \$700,000.

Generally with the loan assistance, low-income families can afford homes under \$325,000. The maximum purchase price for a home allowed in the program is \$362,790. The median purchase price for the county unincorporated areas in 2012 is \$275,000.

The County also received \$600,000 from CalHome, Proposition 1C funding for First-Time Homebuyers in 2007. The maximum funding per home in this program is \$36,650, seven loans were made with these funds.

For fiscal year 2012/2013, a new award of \$300,000 of CalHome funds has been received and the county anticipates assisting up to six first time homebuyers.

### ***Employee Housing Policy***

The Placer County General Plan requires new commercial development in the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe areas to provide for affordable employee housing. For example, resorts must provide for employee housing equal to 50 percent of the increased housing demand generated by the project through one of the following methods: construction of employee housing onsite, construction of employee housing offsite, dedication of land, or payment of an in-lieu fee. The employee housing requirements are triggered when a new development is built or when an existing development is expanded. The employee housing policy is applied as a condition of a use permit, tentative map, or development agreement.

The Martis Valley Community Plan (MVCP) contains a similar employee housing policy for new development in Martis Valley, such as Northstar-at-Tahoe, Timilick, Siller Ranch, Hopkins Ranch, and Martis Ranch. Table 50 summarizes employee housing projects that the County has required in the Sierra Nevada and Lake Tahoe Areas through this program. One project, the 96-unit Sawmill Heights employee housing project at Northstar Village and 10 townhouse units at Hopkins Ranch were completed

under this policy. As of August 2012, one employee housing unit is under construction at Sugar Bowl. Four other projects have been approved and two projects are being proposed.

<b>TABLE 50 EMPLOYEE HOUSING PROJECTS Sierra Nevada And Lake Tahoe Areas, Placer County January 1, 2013</b>		
<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Description of Employee Housing Requirement</b>
Sawmill Heights	Completed	96 employee rental units (or 240 dormitory beds with a capacity for up to 400) for Northstar
Hopkins Ranch	Approved/UC	50 affordable ownership units for Siller Ranch 10– units have been completed.
Squaw Creek Resort	Approved	9 employee units for Phase II. Housing Mitigation Plan required.
Northstar	Approved	174 additional employee units to serve through Phase 6. Housing Mitigation Plan required.
Sugar Bowl	Under Construction	Provide affordable employee housing in each phase of expansion to house 50 percent of the employees generated by 62 condominiums and 1,900 square feet of retail development; One, 3BR unit required.
Timilick	Approved	8 moderate income units and 48 affordable/employee housing units
Homewood	Approved	13 workforce housing units for 26 employees. Workforce housing plan required.
Tahoe Timeshare	Entitlements	3 workforce housing units
Squaw Valley Specific Plan	Entitlements	unknown

Source: Placer County Planning Department, August 2012.

### ***Housing Trust Fund***

A Housing Trust Fund has been established to increase and improve the supply of affordable housing. The funding sources for the Fund include in-lieu fees and employee housing needs fees. The Housing Trust Fund has approximately \$900,000 as of June 2012

### **Placer County Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)**

The Department of Health and Human Services functions as the Housing Authority Agent for the Board of Supervisors. HHS administers the following housing-related programs:

#### ***Housing Choice Voucher Program***

The Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) Program (formerly Section 8 Rental Assistance) is a Federal program that provides rental assistance to low- and very low-income persons in the form of tenant-based vouchers. The Health and Human Services Department administers the Section 8 HCV Program for the Placer County Housing Authority. Section 8 vouchers cover the difference between the fair market rent payment standards established by HUD and what a tenant can afford to pay (generally between 30 and 40 percent of their income for rent and utilities). Many of those receiving Section 8 vouchers are elderly or disabled households.

As of July 2012, Placer County has 311 vouchers available and currently 286 are being used. Placer County has received 35 vouchers from HUD for the HUD/VASH (Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing) which is included in the total number of allocated vouchers. Eligible voucher holders have had difficulty locating properties to rent due to the lack of landlord participation and the “gap” between the payment

standard set by HUD and the cost of market rate rental housing in Placer County. Often, housing eligible within the HUD payment standards is among the subsidized rental stock in Placer County, a market that is very limited and often has long wait lists. Currently, the most availability is in subsidized complexes in Lincoln. The Section 8 Program also requires voucher holders to secure a lease on an apartment within 60 days (and Placer County occasionally has to extend the search period to 120 days), which can be difficult due to the shortage of properties to which tenants can apply their vouchers. As a result, allocated vouchers may be underutilized.

The waiting list for HCV vouchers reopened for two weeks in October 2007, during which time the Housing Authority received 1,500 applications. Previously, the waiting list for Section 8 vouchers was opened for two weeks in February 2001; during this period, the Housing Authority received nearly 900 applications.

### ***Placer County HHS-ASOC-Housing Programs***

Adult System of Care (ASOC) has programs that provide rental assistance and supportive services to qualified individuals. The basic requirement is that individuals be homeless, Placer County resident and have a documented disabling condition.

### **Other Local Organizations**

#### ***Placer Independent Resource Services (PIRS)***

This service is for referrals and advocacy, personal attendant registry and minor home modifications for accessibility. Internet use to look for housing is available.

## ***2. State and Federal Funding Programs***

In addition to the funding programs available through the County Department of Health and Human Services, and other local organizations, there are a number of State and Federal funding programs available that assist first-time homebuyers, build affordable housing, and help special needs groups, such as seniors and large households.

For many programs entities other than the County, including for-profit and non-profit developers, apply for funds or other program benefits. For example, developers apply directly to USDA for Section 515 loans or to HUD for Section 202 and Section 811 loans or to the California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) for low-income tax credits.

County financial support of private sector applications for funding to outside agencies is very important. Funding provided by the County can be used as matching funds required by some programs. Local funding is also used for leverage. County support of private sector applications enhances the competitive advantage of each application for funds.

Table 51 summarizes several of the State and Federal funding programs that are available to fund affordable housing opportunities.

**TABLE 51  
FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR HOUSING  
2012**

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Program Description</b>
<b>Federal Programs</b>	
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	Provides grants for acquisition, rehabilitation, home buyer assistance, economic development, homeless assistance, and public services
HOME	Provides grants to jurisdictions on a competitive basis for acquisition, rehabilitation, home buyer assistance, and rental assistance
Home Ownership for People Everywhere (HOPE)	HOPE program provides grants to low income people to achieve homeownership. The three programs are: HOPE I—Public Housing Homeownership Program HOPE II—Homeownership of Multifamily Units Program HOPE III—Homeownership for Single-family Homes
Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA)	Funds are made available countywide for supportive social services, affordable housing development, and rental assistance to persons with HIV/AIDS.
Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC)	Provides Federal and state income tax credits to persons and corporations that invest in low-income rental housing projects.
Mortgage Credit Certificate (MCC) Program	Provides income tax credits to first-time homebuyers to buy new or existing homes.
Federal Emergency Shelter Grant Program (FESG)	Provides grants to jurisdictions to implement a broad range of activities that serve the homeless. Eligible activities include shelter construction, shelter operation, social services, and homeless prevention.
Section 8 Rental Voucher Program	Provides financial assistance to public housing authorities to fund rental assistance payments to owners of private market-rate units on behalf of very low-income tenants.
Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program	Provides loan guarantees to CDBG entitlement jurisdictions for capital improvement projects that benefit low- and moderate-income persons, or aid in the prevention of slums. Maximum loan amount can be up to five times the jurisdiction's recent annual allocation. Maximum loan term is 20 years. Eligible activities include acquisition, rehabilitation, home buyer assistance, economic development, homeless assistance, and public services.
Section 202	Provides an interest-free capital advance to cover the costs of construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of very low-income senior housing. The sponsor does not have to repay the capital advance as long as the project serves the target population for 40 years. Rental assistance funds are provided for three years, and are renewable based on the availability of funds. The program is available to private, non-profit sponsors. Public sponsors are not eligible for the program.
Section 811	Provides an interest-free capital advance to cover the costs of construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of housing for persons with disabilities. The sponsor does not have to repay the capital advance as long as the project serves the target population for 40 years. Rental assistance funds are provided for three years, and are renewable based on the availability of funds. The program is available to private, non-profit sponsors. Public sponsors are not eligible for the program.
Shelter Plus Care Program (S+C)	Provides rental assistance for hard-to-serve homeless persons with disabilities in connection with supportive services funded from sources outside the program.
Supportive Housing Program	Provides funding for transitional housing and supportive services for homeless persons.
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Housing Programs (Section 514/516)	Provides below market-rate loans and grants for new construction or rehabilitation of farmworker rental housing.
<b>State Programs</b>	
Affordable Housing Innovation Program—Catalyst Community Grant Program	Provides grants for construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of capital assets in designated Catalyst Communities.
Affordable Housing Innovation Program—Golden State Acquisition Level	Provides quick acquisition financing for the development or preservation of affordable housing. Loans with terms up to 5 years are provided to housing sponsors and developers through a nonprofit fund manager.
Affordable Housing Innovation Program – Local Housing Trust Fund	Provides matching grants (dollar-for-dollar) to local housing trust funds that are funded on an ongoing basis from private contributions or public sources (that are not otherwise restricted). The grants may be used to provide loans for construction of rental housing

**TABLE 51  
FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR HOUSING  
2012**

<b>Program Name</b>	<b>Program Description</b>
	that is deed-restricted for at least 55 years to very low-income households, and for down-payment assistance to qualified first-time homebuyers.
Building Equity and Growth in Neighborhoods (BEGIN)	A homeownership program that provides grants to local governments that reduce regulatory constraints to housing. The grants are used for down-payment assistance, in the form of a low-interest loan, to low- and moderate-income first-time homebuyers.
CalHOME	Provides grants to local governments and non-profit agencies for local home buyer assistance and owner-occupied rehabilitation programs and new development projects. Funds can be used to finance the acquisition, rehabilitation, and replacement of manufactured homes.
California Self-Help Housing Program (CSHHP)	Provides grants for sponsor organizations that provide technical assistance for low- and moderate-income families to build their homes with their own labor.
Disaster Recovery Initiative (DRI) / Disaster Recovery Enhancement Fund (DREF)	Provides grants for the construction, acquisition, rehabilitation, and preservation of affordable rental and ownership housing, homeless shelters and transitional housing; public services; public facilities and infrastructure projects for the primary benefit of low- and moderate-income persons; where applicable, the development or retention of jobs for lower income workers; and forward thinking hazard mitigation planning activities.
Emergency Housing and Assistance Program Capital Development (EHAPCD)	Provides grants and loans to support emergency housing. Two types of assistance are available: 1) deferred payment loans for capital development activities; and 2) grants for facility operating costs.
Emergency Solutions Grants Program	Provides grants to fund projects that serve homeless individuals and families with supportive services, emergency shelter, and transitional housing; assist persons at risk of becoming homeless with homelessness prevention assistance; and provide permanent housing to the homeless.
Enterprise Zone Program	Provides State income tax-based credits to support the establishment, expansion and retention of businesses within designated zones.
Governor's Homeless Initiative (GHI)	Provides deferred payment permanent loans through HCD's Multifamily Housing Program (MHP-SH); construction, bridge and permanent loans from the California Housing Finance Agency (CalHFA); and grants for rental assistance from the Department of Mental Health (DMH) to fund new construction, rehabilitation, acquisition, and rehabilitation of permanent rental housing, and conversion of nonresidential structures to rental housing.
HOME Investment Partnerships Program (HOME)	Provides grants to municipalities that do not receive HOME funds from HUD for the rehabilitation, new construction, and acquisition and rehabilitation of single-family and multifamily housing projects; first-time homebuyer mortgage assistance; owner-occupied rehabilitation; and tenant-based rental assistance programs.
Housing-Related Parks Program	Provides grants for the creation of new parks or the rehabilitation and improvement of existing parks and recreational facilities.
Infill Infrastructure Grant Program (IIG)	Provides grants to assist in the new construction and rehabilitation of infrastructure that supports higher-density affordable and mixed-income housing in locations designated as infill.
Joe Serna, Jr. Farmworker Housing Grant Program	Provides matching grants and loans for the acquisition, development, and financing of ownership and rental housing for farmworkers.
Mobilehome Park Resident Ownership Program (MPROP)	Provides loans to mobile home park resident organizations, non-profit entities, and local public agencies to finance the preservation of affordable mobile home parks by conversion to ownership control.
Multi-family Housing Program (MHP)	Deferred payment loans for the new construction, rehabilitation, and preservation of rental housing, supportive housing, and housing for homeless youth.
Office of Migrant Services (OMS)	Provides grants to local government agencies that contract with HCD to operate OMS centers located throughout the state for the construction, rehabilitation, maintenance, and operation of seasonal rental housing for migrant farmworkers.
Predevelopment Loan Program (PDLP)	Provides short-term predevelopment loans to finance the start of low-income housing projects.
State Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG)	Provides grants to fund housing activities, public works, community facilities, public service projects, planning and evaluation studies, and economic assistance to local businesses and low-income microenterprise owners serving lower-income people in small, typically rural communities.

**TABLE 51  
FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR HOUSING  
2012**

Program Name	Program Description
TOD Housing Program	Provides grants and/or loans for the development and construction of mixed-use and rental housing development projects, homeownership mortgage assistance, and infrastructure necessary for the development of housing near transit stations. (Note: applies to specific transit stations in particular cities)
<b>Private Resources</b>	
California Community Reinvestment Corporation (CCRC)	Non-profit mortgage banking consortium that provides long-term debt financing for multi-family affordable rental housing. CCRC specializes in programs for families, seniors, citizens with special needs, and mixed-use developments. Both non-profit and for-profit developers are eligible.
Federal Home Loan Bank Affordable Housing Program	Provides direct subsidies to non-profit and for-profit developers, and public agencies for the construction of affordable low-income ownership and rental projects.
Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae)	A shareholder-owned company with a Federal charter that operates in the secondary mortgage market. Fannie Mae provides a variety of mortgages for single- and multi-family housing, and has programs specifically designed for affordable housing.
Freddie Mac Home Works	A government-sponsored enterprise that provides first and second mortgages.
Savings Association Mortgage Company (SAMCO)	Statewide loan pool that provides thirty-year permanent loans for the construction and redevelopment of affordable housing projects, serving persons earning up to 120% of the median income.

Source: Compiled by Mintier Harnish, September 2012

### ***3. Assisted Housing Projects in Placer County***

There are numerous assisted housing projects in Placer County, including four projects in the unincorporated area of North Auburn: Snow Cap View Apartments, Auburn Court Apartments, Colonial Village, and Terracina Oaks. Snow Cap View Apartments is an 80-unit apartment complex serving low-, median-, and moderate-income tenants in North Auburn. In 2002, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency provided funds to extend the affordability for residents. Auburn Courts, a 60-unit apartment complex in North Auburn, also received funds from the Redevelopment Agency in 2001 to provide affordable housing to very low and low-income households. The Placer County Redevelopment Agency provided funds along with California Federal Tax Credits, HOME New Construction, and Infill Infrastructure Funds for 77 units of restricted affordable housing in the North Tahoe Basin in Kings Beach. The units were completed in 2011 and 2012 on five sites. Table 52 lists all assisted housing projects in unincorporated Placer County. The developer of Terracina Oaks has asked the County to support an application for tax exempt bond financing for rehabilitation of the property. The affordability restrictions will be extended for an additional 55 years with a new expiration date of 2067. The County's loan for Sawmill Heights was forgiven in exchange for an extension of the affordability restrictions. Sawmill Heights affordability would have expired in 2026, the affordability has been extended until 2061.

**TABLE 52  
ASSISTED RENTAL HOUSING PROJECTS**

**Placer County  
2012**

<b>Property</b>	<b>Units</b>	<b>Bedrooms</b>	<b>Target Population</b>	<b>Subsidy</b>	<b>Expiration</b>
Snowcap View Apartments 3540 Snowcap View Circle (N. Auburn)	80	1, 2, and 3	Low-, median-, and moderate-income	Section 515	4/12/2022
Auburn Court Apartments 12199 Gateway Court (N. Auburn)	60	2, 3, and 4	Very low- and low-income	Tax credits	2/14/2056
Sawmill Heights Northstar Village	12	Studio, 2, and 4	Low	Housing Trust Fund (HTF)	6/2061
Terracina Oaks 12200 Gateway Court (N. Auburn)	56	2 and 3	Very low and low	Tax credits, Tax-Exempt Bond Financing	2067
Colonial Village 2205 Colonial Village (N. Auburn)	56	2 and 3	Very low and low	Tax credits	2045
Foresthill Apartments 5771 Gold Street	34 (29 affordable units)	1, 2, and 3	Family	Section 515	11/20/2016
Kings Beach Housing	77	1, 2, and 3	Very low and low	Tax credits	2067

Source: SACOG Housing Element Data Profiles, November 2012; "Multifamily Affordable Housing in Placer County, 2012", and "Housing in Placer County," ASOC Housing Team, 2012

#### **4. Preserving At-Risk Units**

State law requires that housing elements include an inventory of all publicly assisted multi-family rental housing projects within the local jurisdiction that are at risk of conversion to uses other than low-income residential ten years from the start of the current planning period (January 1, 2013 through January 1, 2023)

California Government Code Section 65863.10 requires that owners of federally-assisted properties must provide notice of intent to convert their properties to market rate twelve months and six months prior to the expiration of their contract, opt-outs, or prepayment. Owners must provide notices of intent to public agencies, including HCD, the local redevelopment agency, and the local public housing authority, and to all impacted tenant households. The six-month notice must include specific information on the owner's plans, timetables, and reasons for termination. Under Government Code Section 65863.11, owners of federally-assisted projects must provide a Notice of Opportunity to Submit an Offer to Purchase to Qualified Entities, non-profit or for-profit organizations that agree to preserve the long-term affordability if they should acquire at-risk projects, at least one year before the sale or expiration of use restrictions. Qualified Entities have first right of refusal for acquiring at-risk units.

According to County staff, preserving existing affordable housing costs roughly half the cost of creating new units and has therefore been a County priority. As of September 1, 2012, Placer County had not received any notices of intent to convert within the coming year. Snowcap View Apartments, a Section 515 property with 80 units in North Auburn, had provided HCD with notice of intent to convert in 2005. Through CDBG loans, the County Redevelopment Agency provided a rehabilitation loan to the owners to

extend the covenant for 15 years. The affordability covenant on Foresthill Apartments—a Section 515 property with 34 units in the Foresthill community—is scheduled to expire in 2016, making it at risk of conversion to market rate during the Housing Element planning period.

Foresthill Apartments provides 34 units, 29 of which are affordable—residents pay 30 percent of adjusted income. The amount of the subsidy is based on debt servicing and operating cost for the project. If Foresthill Apartments is able to retain its rental subsidies through Rural Development, the estimated cost of continuing to subsidize the 29 assisted is \$165 per unit per month based on the difference between the 2012 HUD FMR rate of \$1,021 and the \$856 for a 2-bedroom unit that a very low-income household can afford to pay. Over a 30-year period, the estimated cost of subsidizing 29 units is \$1.72 million.

Table 53 shows the estimated costs of constructing new units to replace the 29 units at Foresthill Apartments if the at-risk project were to convert to market rate housing. Assuming that the 29 units were to be replaced, the total replacement cost would be approximately \$6.73 million (\$232,000 per unit). This estimate is based on the total development costs identified in this Housing Element Background Report (see Section B. Non-Governmental Constraints). It would require additional funding sources to replace these affordable units.

<b>Fee/Cost Type</b>	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>Cost Per Unit</b>
Land Acquisition (NOTE: would need about 1.4 acres site (21 units/acre) at \$300,000/acre)	\$420,500	\$14,500
Construction (\$200/sq. ft. x 800 sq. ft./unit x 29 units)	\$4,640,000	\$160,000
Typical Residential Development Fees (See Table 60)	\$800,000	\$28,000
Financing/Other Soft Costs	\$870,000	\$30,000
<b>Total Estimated Cost</b>	<b>\$6,730,000</b>	<b>\$232,000</b>

Source: Mintier Harnish, 2013

Table 54 shows the estimated costs of acquiring and rehabilitating an at-risk affordable housing project. It would require approximately \$145,000 per unit to acquire and rehabilitate the 29 affordable units at Foresthill Apartments. Rehabilitation would cost an estimated \$87,500 less per unit than replacement.

<b>Fee/Cost Type</b>	<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>Cost Per Unit</b>
Acquisition	\$3,500,000	\$120,000
Rehabilitation	\$500,000	\$17,000
Financing/Other Soft Costs	\$290,000	\$10,000
<b>Total Estimated Cost</b>	<b>\$4,290,000</b>	<b>\$145,000</b>

Source: Mintier Harnish

In 2003, the Placer County Redevelopment Agency contacted the property managers of Foresthill Apartments, who indicated that the owners were not interested in rehabilitation loans and would likely extend the affordability on their own. Through Programs E-1, E-2, and E-3, the County will monitor the status of this project and contact owners concerning their plans to continue in or opt out of the subsidy programs. If necessary, the County will identify potential buyers of the at-risk project, such as those listed as qualified entities. The County will also identify possible sources of County funding, including housing set-aside funds, to supplement primary state and federal sources.

There are a variety of Federal, State, and local programs available for the preservation of at-risk affordable units.

### **Federal Programs to Preserve At-Risk Units**

For below-market properties, Section 8 preservation tools include the Mark-Up-to-Market program, which provides incentives for for-profit property owners to remain in the Section 8 program after their contracts expire. The Mark-Up-to-Market program allows non-profit owners to increase below-market rents to acquire new property or make capital repairs while preserving existing Section 8 units. For above-market properties, Mark-to-Market provides owners with debt restructuring in exchange for renewal of Section 8 contracts for 30 years.

For Section 236 properties, Interest Reduction Payment (IRP) Retention/ Decoupling enables properties to retain IRP subsidy when new or additional financing is secured.

Due to the termination of two major federal preservation programs (LIHPRHA and ELIHPA), and the limitations of existing federal tools such as Mark-to-Market, state and local actors must assume a greater role in preserving HUD-assisted properties.

Section 515 enables USDA to provide deeply subsidized loans directly to developers of rural rental housing. Loans have thirty year terms and are amortized over fifty years. The program gives first priority to individuals living in substandard housing.

Several resources are available for preservation of Section 515 resources. Non-profit organizations can acquire Section 515 properties and assume the current mortgage or receive a new mortgage to finance acquisition and rehabilitation of the structures. Section 538 Rental Housing Loan Guarantees are available for the Section 514 and 516 loans and grants are also available for purchase and rehabilitation of Section 515 properties that are occupied by farmworkers. Section 533 provides a Housing Preservation Grant Program, which funds rehabilitation, but not acquisition.

### **State Programs to Preserve At-Risk Units**

At the state level, the California Housing Finance Agency offers low interest loans to preserve long-term affordability for multi-family rental properties through its Preservation Acquisition Finance Program.

The Division of Financial Assistance within Housing and Community Development offers the Preservation Interim Repositioning Program (PIRP) to provide short-term acquisition loans for assisted rental units at-risk of conversion to market rate. As of September 2007, HCD had committed all available funds and was not accepting new applications.

The Division of Financial Assistance also offers Multifamily Housing Program (MHP), which provides deferred payment loans for preservation of permanent and transitional rental housing, as well as new construction and rehabilitation.

The HOME Investment Partnerships Program provides grants to cities and counties and low-interest loans to state-certified community housing development organizations to create and preserve affordable housing for single- and multi-family projects benefitting lower-income renters or owners.

### **Local Programs to Preserve At-Risk Units**

Placer County can apply for and receives HOME and CDBG funds that it can direct through grants and loans to extend affordability covenants on expiring properties.

Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDOs) can apply directly to the State for HOME funds for preservation. The only local group in this category is Mercy Housing, but it has not pursued HOME funds for preservation purposes. The only locally-based non-profit organization in the county involved in preservation is Project Go, which owns Colonial Village Apartments in North Auburn.

Qualified entities are non-profit or for-profit organizations with the legal and managerial capacity to acquire and manage at-risk properties that agree to maintain the long-term affordability of projects. The following is a list of Qualified Entities for Placer County:

- ACLC, Inc. (Stockton)
- Affordable Housing Foundation (San Francisco)
- Christian Church Homes of Northern California, Inc. (Oakland)
- Eskaton Properties, Inc. (Carmichael)
- Project Go, Inc. (Rocklin)
- Mercy Housing California
- St. Joseph Community Land Trust (South Lake Tahoe)

## **C. Energy Conservation Opportunities**

State Housing Element Law requires an analysis of the opportunities for energy conservation in residential development. Energy efficiency has direct application to affordable housing because the more money spent on energy, the less available for rent or mortgage payments. High energy costs have particularly detrimental effects on low-income households that do not have enough income or cash reserves to absorb cost increases and must choose between basic needs such as shelter, food, and energy. In addition, energy price increases combined with rolling electricity blackouts over the past decade have led to a renewed interest in energy conservation. This section describes opportunities for conserving energy in existing homes as well as in new residential construction. It discusses the factors affecting energy use, conservation programs currently available in Placer County, and examples of effective programs used by other jurisdictions.

All new buildings in California must meet the standards contained in Title 24, Part 6, of the California Code of Regulations (Building Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Nonresidential Buildings).

These regulations respond to California's energy crisis and need to reduce energy bills, increase energy delivery system reliability, and contribute to an improved economic condition for the state. They were established in 1978 and most recently updated in 2010 (effective date of January 1, 2011). Local governments through the building permit process enforce energy efficiency requirements. All new construction must comply with the standards in effect on the date a building permit application is made.

There is a new section within the California Building Code that now includes green building regulations. This is referred to as CALGreen. This is the nation's first mandatory state-wide green building code, intended to encourage more sustainable and environmentally friendly building practices, require low pollution emitting substances that can cause harm to the environment, conservation of our natural resources, and promote the use of energy efficient materials and equipment.

#### CALGreen Requirements for New Buildings:

- Reduce water consumption by 20 percent.
- Divert 50 percent of construction waste from landfills.
- Install low pollutant-emitting materials.
- Requires separate water meters for nonresidential buildings' indoor and outdoor water use.
- Requires moisture-sensing irrigation systems for larger landscape projects.
- Requires mandatory inspections of energy systems (e.g., heat furnace, air conditioner and mechanical equipment) for nonresidential buildings over 10,000 square feet to ensure that all are working at their maximum capacity and according to their design efficiencies.

Placer County fully enforces the provisions of Title 24 of the California Administrative Code. The code is a comprehensive and uniform regulatory code for all residential, commercial, hospital and school buildings. The standards found in Title 24 create energy savings of approximately 50 percent over residential construction practices used prior to the standards.

The primary energy conservation program for older homes in Placer County is the free weatherization program sponsored by Sierra Pacific Power, WP Natural Gas, and Project Go, Inc., an independent, private non-profit organization that specializes in home repairs. The program provides a free weatherization service and energy-efficient home improvements to low-income and elderly people. Services include attic insulation, energy-efficient showerheads, faucet aerators, water heater blankets, door weather-stripping, caulking, and glass storm windows. Recipients of CalWORKS and State Disability Insurance are automatically eligible.

Placer County will also encourage participation in the California Multifamily New Homes (CMFNH) program, sponsored by PG&E. The program facilitates energy-efficient design and construction in multifamily housing through design assistance and cash incentives. CMFNH benefits include energy efficiency services for developers, architects, engineers, energy consultants, and property owners.

Placer County encourages energy efficiency in residential construction by emphasizing energy-efficient construction practices. The County provides an information sheet to builders that discusses the short and long-run costs and benefits of energy-efficient design and construction, and provides a list of the local dealers, contractors, and suppliers of conservation materials.

To encourage investments in energy efficiency, Placer County also sponsors the mPower Placer program for commercial and multi-family properties. The program, launched in 2010, provides special assessment financing for energy efficiency and renewable energy projects. Loans are repaid through property taxes.

mPOWER Placer provides financing to make water and energy efficiency improvements on non-residential buildings, as well as power generation improvements such as solar photovoltaic for commercial and multi-family property owners in Placer County. Other eligible projects include installation of energy-efficient lighting, energy monitoring systems, cool and green roofs, insulation, HVAC upgrades, and smart cooling systems.

When mPOWER was started, financing was available to both residential and commercial property owners. However, due to directives from the Federal Home Finance Agency (FHFA), the regulatory agency that oversees Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the single-family residential portion of the program has been suspended. Placer County is aggressively pursuing resolution to this action so that homeowners will have the same opportunities as commercial property owners.

## **SECTION III: POTENTIAL HOUSING CONSTRAINTS**

State housing law requires the County to review both governmental and non-governmental constraints to the maintenance and production of housing for all income levels. Since local governmental actions can restrict the development and increase the cost of housing, State law requires the Housing Element to “address and, where appropriate and legally possible, remove governmental constraints to the maintenance, improvement, and development of housing” (Government Code Section 65583(c)(3)).

### **A. Potential Governmental Constraints**

Local governments have little or no influence upon the national economy or the Federal monetary policies which influence it. Yet these two factors have some of the most significant impacts on the overall cost of housing. The local housing market, however, can be encouraged and assisted locally. Part of the housing element’s purpose is to require local governments to evaluate their past performance in this regard. By reviewing local conditions and regulations that may impact the housing market, the local government can prepare for future growth through actions that protect the public’s health and safety without unduly adding to the cost of housing production.

Placer County’s primary policies and regulations that affect residential development and housing affordability include land use controls, development processing procedures and fees, impact fees, on- and off-site improvement requirements, and building and housing codes and enforcement. This section discusses these standards and assesses whether any serve as a constraint to affordable housing development. Because development in the Tahoe Basin falls under the jurisdiction of both Placer County and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA), the discussion of government constraints also reviews impediments to affordable housing production due to the regulatory framework of TRPA.

As part of the governmental constraints analysis, the Housing Element must also analyze potential and actual constraints upon the development, maintenance, and improvement of housing for persons with disabilities. Additional analysis of these constraints is included at the end of this section.

## 1. General Plan and Zoning

Land use controls guide local growth and development. The Placer County General Plan, community plans, and Zoning Ordinance establish the amount and distribution of land allocated for different uses, including housing. The following discussion focuses on their general intent and their impact on housing production.

### General Plan Land Use Designations

Placer County's General Plan was adopted in 1994. The Land Use Element of the General Plan sets forth the County's policies for guiding local land use development. As summarized in Table 55 below, the Land Use Element establishes four residential land use designations and two commercial land use designations that permit residential uses.

<b>TABLE 55</b>			
<b>LAND USE DESIGNATIONS PERMITTING RESIDENTIAL USE</b>			
<b>Placer County</b>			
<b>General Plan Designation</b>	<b>Compatible Zoning Ordinance Classification</b>	<b>Residential Uses Allowed</b>	<b>Dwelling Units per Acre</b>
RR-Rural Residential	RA (Residential-Agricultural) RF (Residential-Forest)	Detached single-family and secondary dwellings	1 unit/acre
LDR-Low Density residential	RA (Residential-Agricultural) RS (Residential Single-Family)	Detached single-family and secondary dwellings	1-5 units/acre
MDR-Medium Density Residential	RS (Residential Single-Family) RM (Residential Multifamily) -DL (Density Limitation Combining District)	Detached and attached single-family, secondary dwellings, and smaller-scale multi-family	5-10 units/acre
HDR-High Density Residential	RM (Residential Multifamily) -DL (Density Limitation Combining District)	Detached and attached single-family, secondary dwellings, and all types of multi-family	10-21 units/acre
GC-General Commercial	CPD (Commercial Planned Development) C1 (Neighborhood Commercial) C2 (General Commercial) HS (Highway Services)	Multi-family housing as the primary land use or as part of a mixed-use project allowed	0-21 units/acre
TC-Tourist/Resort Commercial	HS (Highway Services) MT (Motel District) RES (Resort)	Multi-family	11-21 units/acre

Source: Placer County General Plan

### Other Local Plans

Placer County has adopted seventeen community plans, some of which include affordable housing policies intended to supplement those found in the General Plan and Housing Element. All of the policies related to housing production support the need for affordable housing and do not result in additional constraints to housing production beyond those associated with the General Plan.

### Zoning Districts

The following discussion reviews the types and densities of housing permitted and relevant development standards in the Placer County Zoning Ordinance.

### ***Residential Districts and Permitting***

The Placer County Zoning Ordinance has four residential districts: Residential Single-Family (RS), Residential Multi-Family (RM), Residential-Agricultural (RA), and Residential-Forest (RF). There are also eight non-residential zoning districts that allow residential uses. Table 56 below shows minimum lot area and average residential density allowed in each zoning district that allows residential uses.

<b>TABLE 56 DENSITY STANDARDS FOR RESIDENCES Placer County 2007</b>		
<b>Zoning District</b>	<b>Minimum Residential Lot Area</b>	<b>Maximum Residential Density (units/acre)</b>
Single-Family Residential (RS)	10,000 square feet	4
Multi-Family Residential (RM)	6,000 square feet	single-family: 7
		multi-family: 21
Agricultural-Residential (RA)	40,000 square feet	1
Forest-Residential (RF)	10 acres	0.1
Neighborhood Commercial (C1)	6,000 square feet-corner lots	Lake Tahoe area: 14 all other areas: 21
	5,000 square feet-interior lots	
General Commercial (C2)	6,000 square feet-corner lots	21
	5,000 square feet-interior lots	
Commercial Planned Development (CPD)	not specified	21
Highway Services (HS)	6,000 square feet	21
Motel District (MT)	10,000 square feet	single-family: 4
		multi-family: 15
Resort (RES)	40,000 square feet	single-family: 1
		multi-family: N/A
Agricultural Exclusive (AE)	20 acres	0.05
Farm (F)	200,000 square feet	0.2

*Source: Placer County Zoning Ordinance, 2012.*

Table 57 summarizes the allowed residential uses and applicable permit requirements for the zoning districts. If the housing type is allowable in a zone, the use is subject to one of the following land use permit requirements:

**Allowed Use (A).** These uses are allowed without land use permit approval. No land use permit is required for "A" uses because they typically involve no or minimal construction activities, are accessory to some other land use that will be the primary use of a site, or are otherwise consistent with the purposes of the particular zone.

**Zoning Clearance (C).** Zoning clearance is a ministerial land use approval that involves Planning Department staff checking a proposed development to ensure that all applicable zoning requirements will be satisfied. If so, the permit is issued.

**Administrative Review Permit (ARP).** ARP approval is a discretionary action required for certain land uses that are generally consistent with the purposes of the zone, but could create minor problems for adjoining properties if they are not designed with sensitivity to surrounding land uses. The purpose of an ARP is to allow Planning Department staff and the Zoning Administrator to evaluate a proposed use to assess the potential for problems to occur, to work with the project applicant to resolve problems, or to disapprove the project if identified problems cannot be corrected.

**Minor Use Permit (MUP).** MUP approval is required for certain land uses that are generally consistent with the purposes of the zone, but could create problems for not only adjoining properties, but also the surrounding area if such uses are not designed to be compatible with existing uses. The purpose of a MUP is to allow Planning Department staff and the Zoning Administrator to evaluate a proposed use to determine if problems may occur, to provide the public an opportunity to review the proposed project and express their concerns in a public hearing, to work with the project applicant to resolve problems, or to disapprove the project if identified problems cannot be corrected.

**Conditional Use Permit (CUP).** CUP approval is required for certain land uses that may be appropriate in a zone, depending on the design of the project and site characteristics. Such a project can either raise major land use policy issues or could create serious problems for adjoining properties and the surrounding area if such uses are not appropriately located and designed. The purpose of a CUP is to allow Planning Department staff and the Placer County Planning Commission an opportunity to evaluate a proposed use to determine if problems may occur, to provide the public an opportunity to review the proposed project and express their concerns in a public hearing, to work with the project applicant to resolve problems, or to disapprove the project if identified problems cannot be corrected.

**TABLE 57  
HOUSING TYPES PERMITTED BY ZONE  
Placer County  
2012**

<b>Housing Types Permitted</b>	<b>RS</b>	<b>RM</b>	<b>RA</b>	<b>RF</b>	<b>C1</b>	<b>C2</b>	<b>CPD</b>	<b>HS</b>	<b>RES</b>	<b>AE</b>	<b>F</b>
Caretaker and employee housing	-	-	-	-	C	C	C	C	MUP	MUP	MUP
Emergency Shelter, 30 or less beds		C			MUP	CUP	CUP	MUP	MUP		
Emergency Shelter, 31 or more		MUP			MUP	CUP	CUP	MUP	MUP		
Farmworker Dwelling Unit			A	A						A	A
Farmworker Housing Complex			A	A						A	A
Home occupations	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	MUP	C	C
Mobile home parks	-	CUP	-	-	CUP	CUP	-	-	-	-	-
Mobile homes	C	C	C	C	-	-	-	-	C	C	C
Multifamily dwellings, 20 or less units	-	C	-	-	MUP	CUP	CUP	MUP	MUP	-	-
Multifamily dwellings, 21 or more	-	MUP	-	-	MUP	CUP	CUP	MUP	MUP	-	-
Residential care homes, 6 or less beds	C	C	C	C	-	-	-	-	C	-	C
Residential care homes, 7 or more	-	MUP	MUP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	MUP
Secondary dwellings	ARP	ARP	ARP	ARP	-	-	-	-	ARP	ARP	ARP
Senior housing developments	-	CUP	-	-	CUP	CUP	CUP	CUP	-	-	-
Single-family dwellings	C	C	C	C	-	-	-	-	C	C	C
SRO Housing Units, 30 or less units		C						MUP	MUP		
SRO Housing Units, 31 or more		MUP						MUP	MUP		
Supportive Housing, 30 or less beds		C			MUP	CUP	CUP	MUP	MUP		
Supportive Housing, 31 or more		MUP			MUP	CUP	CUP	MUP	MUP		
Transitional Housing, 30 or less beds		C			MUP	CUP	CUP	MUP	MUP		
Transitional Housing, 31 or more		MUP			MUP	CUP	CUP	MUP	MUP		

Source: Placer County Zoning Ordinance, 2012.

The setback requirements for residential uses in residential and commercial zones, as specified in the Placer County Zoning Ordinance, are shown below in Table 58. The Zoning Ordinance states that residential dwellings proposed in any commercial zones shall provide side and rear setbacks as required in the Multi-Family Residential districts, except when the dwelling is located within a commercial building. The setbacks, maximum coverage, and height requirements are similar to other communities throughout the state and are not considered a constraint to the development of affordable housing.

**TABLE 58  
SETBACK, LOT COVERAGE, AND HEIGHT REQUIREMENTS IN RESIDENTIAL  
ZONES**

**Placer County**

Zone Designation	Front Setback	Side Setback	Rear Setback	Maximum Coverage	Maximum Height
<b>Residential</b>					
Single-Family Residential	20 ft.	15 ft. total, 5 ft. min.-one story; 7 ½ ft. min.-two stories or more	10ft. min-one story; 20 ft. min. two stories or more	40% max.-one story; 35% max. two or more stories	30 ft.
Multi-Family Residential	20 ft.	15 ft. total, 5 ft. min.-one story; 7 ½ ft. min.-two stories or more	10ft. Min-one story; 20 ft. min.-two stories or more	40% max.-one story; 35% max. two or more stories	36 ft.
Residential-Forest	50 ft.	30 ft.	30 ft.	10%	36 ft.
Residential-Agricultural	50 ft.	30 ft.	30 ft.	35%	36 ft.
<b>Commercial<sup>1</sup></b>					
Neighborhood Commercial	10 ft.	15 ft. total, 5 ft. min.-one story; 7 ½ ft. min.-two stories or more	10 ft. min-one story; 20 ft. min.-two stories or more	40%	30 ft.
General Commercial	10 ft.	15 ft. total, 5 ft. min.-one story; 7 ½ ft. min.-two stories or more	10 ft. min-one story; 20 ft. min.-two stories or more	40%	50 ft.
Commercial Planned Development	n/a <sup>2</sup>	15 ft. total, 5 ft. min.-one story; 7 ½ ft. min.-two stories or more	10 ft. min-one story; 20 ft. min.-two stories or more	50%	50 ft.
Highway Services	25 ft.	15 ft. total, 5 ft. min.-one story; 7 ½ ft. min.-two stories or more	10 ft. min-one story; 20 ft. min.-two stories or more	40%	35 ft.

Source: Placer County Zoning Ordinance, 2012

<sup>1</sup>The side and rear setbacks described in the table apply to stand-alone residential projects in commercial zones. A 5-foot side and rear setback applies to buildings in most commercial zones that contain a mix of residential and commercial uses. The exception is in the Highway Services district where a 10-foot rear setback is required.

<sup>2</sup>As required by CUP or MUP. The CPD setbacks are determined by the use permit except for senior housing projects, which are specified to have a front setback of 20' and the sides and rear are a 10' minimum.

### **Overlay and Combining Districts**

The Zoning Ordinance includes combining districts, which are used in conjunction with the zone districts to address special needs or characteristics of specific areas. The following are combining zones which impact residential development in the county:

- **Density Limitation.** Density Limitation (-DL) is a multi-faceted combining district that provides special minimum lot size and density standards for certain areas where residential development may occur and where sensitive site characteristics or other special circumstances exist. The DL combining district allows for increased flexibility on lots that may be difficult to develop and encourages infill development through reduced set back and lot size requirements. This district also allows greater maximum lot coverage than the base residential zone districts (RS and RM).

In the RS and RM zone districts, the front setback is 20 feet, the side setbacks are 15 feet total, a 5 feet minimum for one story and a 7.5 feet minimum for two stories, and the rear setback is 10 feet minimum for one story and twenty feet for two stories. The maximum site coverage is 40 percent for one story and 35 percent for two stories. In the combining DL district these standards are relaxed. The front setback is reduced to 12.5 feet, the side setback is 5 feet for one story and 7.5 for two stories or more, and the rear setback is ten feet. The maximum coverage is increased to 50 percent for one story and 40 percent for two stories.

The DL zone district helps implement the General Plan and in some cases higher densities may not be appropriate. In cases where higher densities are appropriate, the combining DL district allows for greater lot coverage than the base residential zone and can permit up to 22 units per acre, which is the maximum permitted by the Zoning Ordinance.

- **Building Site.** The Building Site (-B) combining district allows parcels in new subdivisions to differ in size from what the zoning ordinance would otherwise allow. The parcel size is based upon special characteristics of the site such as environmental characteristics and community character. The building site combining district allows lots as small as 3,000 square feet.
- **Design Review.** The design review (-Dc, -Dh, -Ds) combining districts create regulations for protecting and enhancing the aesthetic value of lands or specific buildings. The three design review combining districts are "design scenic corridor" (-Dc), "design sierra" (-Ds), and "design historic"(-Dh).

Dc and Ds designations are applied to areas of special natural beauty and aesthetic interest that contribute to the county's tourism economy. The Dh designation establishes regulations for areas or buildings of historical or cultural significance in the county. These areas require special considerations to preserve existing residential structures as a community resource. Development restrictions are imposed in this overlay zone related to the demolition, removal, relocation, or alteration of any residential building, structure, or site in the Dh combining zone without a permit. Once a design review designation has been made by the zoning board, no new construction or changes to existing buildings can be made without gaining design review approval.

- **Planned Residential Development.** The Zoning Ordinance implements the Planned Residential Development land use overlay through the Planned Residential Development (PD) combining zone. This designation allows flexibility of standards and density requirements, and encourages cluster development, mixed-use, apartments, and condominiums in areas specified in the County General Plan and other community plans. All PDs are to be consistent with the goals and policies set forth in the general plan and all community plans, and are to follow the design guidelines applicable to the specific PD area. The designation is a combined land use designation, and the population density and building intensity standards of the base designation apply. The allowable density in the PD zone is determined by multiplying the residential intensity allowed in the base designation by the net buildable area of the site.

## **2. Growth Management**

Growth management is a tool that local governments use to prevent urban sprawl and preserve natural resources and agriculture. Growth management measures, such as urban limit lines (ULLs), can in some instances increase the cost of affordable housing by limiting the amount of land for new development. While Placer County does not have a ULL, it does have a policy in its 1994 General Plan that references growth management. Policy 1.M.1 in the Land Use Element states:

“The County shall concentrate most new growth within existing communities emphasizing infill development, intensified use of existing development, and expanded services, so individual communities become more complete, diverse, and balanced.”

The General Plan also recognizes that as the county continues to grow, additional areas may be identified as being suitable for development at urban or suburban densities and intensities.

The County requires the preparation of individual General Plan Amendments and specific plans for new development areas to determine the most appropriate arrangement and mixture of land uses, circulation system layout, extent of infrastructure and public services, and institutional framework necessary to accommodate development. Where appropriate, annexation is considered first for proposed urban projects. The County supports logical, planned growth, contiguous to existing urban areas and in recent years approved four significant specific plans (Bickford Ranch, Riolo Vineyards, Regional University, and Placer Vineyards) and is currently processing the Squaw Valley Specific Plan.

## **3. Building Codes and Enforcement**

### Overview

Building codes and their enforcement influence the style, quality, size, and costs of residential development. Such codes can increase the cost of housing and impact the feasibility of rehabilitating older properties that must be upgraded to current code standards. In this manner, buildings codes and their enforcement act as a constraint on the supply of housing and its affordability.

On January 1, 2011, significant changes to California Building Codes (CBC) became effective. Changes include the adoption of the first in the nation set of mandatory state green building standards which are known as CALGreen and the addition of mandatory residential fire sprinklers in all new one and two family, town-home and manufactured housing construction. The CBC determines the minimum residential construction requirements throughout California.

Placer County has not made significant additions to the CBC for residential construction in the lower elevations of the County not subject to annual snowfall. Slight modifications, such as special roof design requirements to accommodate snow loads and avalanche protection standards, have been made for construction above a 5,000-foot elevation. These modifications limit the use of new manufactured housing on individual lots, which limits the affordable housing options on vacant lots in the Tahoe Basin portion of the county and in situations where a unit beyond rehabilitation needs replacement.

Beginning in 2008, new fire safety amendments in Chapter 7A of the California Building Code. Wildland-Urban Interface building standards became more stringent. The broad objective of the Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Area Building Standards is to establish minimum standards for materials and material assemblies and provide a reasonable level of exterior wildfire exposure protection for buildings in

Wildland-Urban Interface Fire Areas. It requires the use of ignition resistant materials and design to resist the intrusion of flame or burning embers projected by a vegetation fire (wildfire exposure).

The County has also adopted the State's Uniform Housing Code and the Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings. The Uniform Housing Code regulates the condition of habitable structures with regard to health and safety standards and provides for the conservation and rehabilitation of housing in accordance with the CBC. The Uniform Code for the Abatement of Dangerous Buildings covers the repair, vacation or demolition of dangerous buildings.

As with most jurisdictions, the County responds to code enforcement problems largely on a complaint basis. The usual process is to conduct a field investigation after a complaint has been submitted. If the complaint is found to be valid, the immediacy and severity of the problem is assessed. The County's philosophy is to effectively mitigate serious health or safety problems, while allowing the property owner a reasonable amount of time and flexibility to comply. The more pressing the problem, the more urgent the County action. The County usually achieves compliance with the Uniform Codes through a combination of letters, phone calls, and/or site visits. In cases where the problems are severe and appeals to voluntary solutions to them are unsuccessful, the County will take more aggressive action. In rare cases, the units may be declared hazards and posted as such and/or legal compliance' may be forced through action taken by the District Attorney or County Counsel's office.

#### Conclusions

The County's building codes are consistent with the codes used in other jurisdictions throughout California, and do not negatively impact the construction of affordable housing. The County attempts to find a balance between ensuring that housing is safe and avoiding the potential loss of affordable housing units through unnecessarily strict enforcement practices. Based on discussions with the County, there is no indication that code enforcement practices have unduly penalized older dwellings or have inhibited rehabilitation.

## **4. Design Review**

#### Overview

Design review requirements can sometimes increase the cost of housing, particularly those that require additional costly features be provided in a multi-family housing development. As discussed earlier in the element, the Zoning Ordinance allows establishment of design review combining zones in which all new construction or changes to existing lands or structures cannot occur without design review approval. Construction in specific areas of the county must adhere to design standards described in the Placer County Design Guidelines, Rural Design Guidelines, North Auburn Design Guidelines, and North Tahoe Design Guidelines.

The Placer County General Plan includes policies and programs to allow flexibility in the design review process in order to promote affordable housing projects. Program 2.13 states that the County will amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow:

"...increased flexibility in evaluating a project's architectural conformity to the Placer County Design Guidelines Manual. The design review should encourage simple projects which are attractive and generally consistent with County policy, but are constructed at a lesser cost than market-rate projects."

The Placer County Code, Zoning Ordinance, and Design Guidelines authorize the County to allow flexibility in applying design guidelines based on the merits of individual projects for issues such as buildings arrangements, setbacks, walls, off-street parking, and landscaping.

### Conclusions

Design review is not a significant impediment to the development of affordable housing in Placer County. The County allows flexibility in the design guidelines for affordable housing projects.

## **5. Processing and Permit Procedures**

### Overview

Similar to other jurisdictions, the County has a number of procedures it requires developers to follow for processing development entitlements and building permits. Although the permit approval process must conform to the Permit Streamlining Act (Government Code Section 65920 (*et seq.*)), housing proposed in the County is subject to one or more of the following review processes: environmental review, zoning, subdivision review, specific plan development and review, use permit control, design review, and building permit approval.

The County employs a Zoning Administrator to serve as a hearing officer who is assigned the authority and original jurisdiction to investigate, consider, and approve or deny Administrative Review Permits, Minor Use Permits, and Variances. The usual turn-around for a Zoning Administrator decision is 30 to 60 days after the receipt of a complete application.

Residential development projects requiring environmental review and a discretionary planning approval (Conditional Use Permit) that are on flat ground with available sewer, water, and electricity would take an average six to eight months to process through the Placer County Planning Department; more complicated sites typically take more time. Longer processing times may result from site constraints (wetlands, vernal pools, steep slopes, paleontology or archaeology finds), inadequate application materials, and/or review and comment by numerous other agencies.

Placer County now requires pre-development meetings with applicants of larger projects prior to submission of formal applications to better define the information needed to review a project. Pre-development meetings have helped to shorten the review process and allows for better communication between applicants and County departments.

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the County's permit processing procedures include an assessment of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. The environmental review process helps protect the public from significant environmental degradation and locating inappropriate developments sites. It also gives the public an opportunity to comment on project impacts. However, if a project requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), additional processing, cost, and time is required. EIRs may take nine months or longer to complete depending on its complexity. The Placer County Environmental Review Ordinance provides an exemption for residential construction totaling no more than four dwelling units and for no more than six dwelling units in urbanized areas. Projects consisting of seven or more units may not have an environmental exemption.

CEQA compliance is the first step in the review of a project, prior to scheduling any permit or application before a hearing body. If, after completing the Initial Study, County staff determines that the proposal will have no significant adverse impact upon the environment, the applicant will be notified that a Negative Declaration (or Mitigated Negative Declaration) will be prepared by the County. If staff

determines that the project may have a significant impact, an EIR is required. An EIR is an in-depth analysis of the potentially significant environmental impacts of a project. Once it has been determined that the EIR is acceptable, the EIR is distributed for public review. After either the Negative Declaration or EIR has been completed, the applicant may file the tentative map or Subsequent Entitlement Application, and a public hearing will be set to consider the CEQA document and any other entitlements.

Residential project which are permitted as a "matter of right" and do not need discretionary approval include: single family residences, secondary dwellings, and multi-family project comprising 20 or less units within the Residential Multi-Family zone district. The processing time for these permits which are primarily tied to the Building Plan Check process typically ranges from four to six weeks.

Some projects require discretionary review (minor use permit or conditional use permit). As previously shown in Table 57, multi-family projects in the Residential multifamily (RM) zone district with more than 20 units, and all multi-family projects in the Neighborhood Commercial (C1) district require a minor use permit which is reviewed by the Planning Department staff and Zoning Administrator and discussed at a public hearing.

Residential projects require a conditional use permit in the General Commercial (C2) district. The findings for conditional use permits that are used by the County for project approval include the following:

1. A comparison of the benefits or adverse impacts of the proposal versus traditional lot-and-block development of the property, and a conclusion that the Planned Development proposal is or is not the superior method of development for the site in question.
2. A summary of the benefits or adverse impacts to the community as a result of density increases realized by the project by using this process, and a conclusion regarding the appropriateness of any increased density in the project based upon specific features of the Planned Development proposal.
3. The physical design of the proposal and the manner in which the design does or does not make adequate provision for public services, control over vehicular traffic and the amenities of light and air and recreation and visual enjoyment.
4. The site for the proposed development is physically suitable for the type and proposed density of development.
5. The proposed use is consistent with the character of the immediate neighborhood and will not be contrary to its orderly development.

The County expedites permit processing for development projects containing a low-income residential component through its Permit-Streamlining Program, and prioritizes low-income and senior housing projects in the development review process.

Processing and permit procedures do not constitute a development constraint in Placer County. The County's Permit-Streamlining Program places priority on affordable and senior housing projects, expediting the process.

The Policy Document contains a program to address multi-family development in C1 and C2 zone districts (Program B-12: Multi-Family Housing on Commercial Sites). Amendments such as those outlined in

Program B-11 would allow multi-family residential housing with 20 or fewer units per acre “by right” in C1 and C2 zones, while higher densities in the same zones will be considered with a Minor or Conditional Use Permit. The County anticipates first addressing this issue as part of a larger General Plan Update before adopting any changes to the Zoning Ordinance.

**TABLE 59  
TIMELINE FOR PERMIT PROCEDURES  
Placer County  
2012**

Type of Approval or Permit	Typical Processing Time	Approval Body
Annexation**	1 year	Board of Supervisors
EIR	1-2 years	Planning Commission
Mitigated or Negative Declaration	3 to 6 months	Zoning Admin/Planning Commission
General Plan Amendment	6 months to 2 years	Board of Supervisors
Planned Development	6 months to 1 year	Planning Commission
Site Plan & Design Review*	1 to 3 months	Design/Site Review Committee
Density Bonus	Included with entitlement processing; not a stand-alone process	Varies
Specific Plan**	2 to 3 years	Board of Supervisors
Subdivision Map	6 months to 2 years	Planning Commission
Conditional (Major) Use Permit	6 months to 1 year	Planning Commission
Minor Use Permit	30 to 90 days	Zoning Admin* or Planning Commission
Variance	30 to 60 days	Zoning Admin/Planning Commission
Rezone**	1 to 2 years	Board of Supervisors

Notes:

\* When exempt from CEQA; otherwise approval body is Planning Commission

\*\* Upon recommendation from the Planning Commission

Source: Placer County Planning Department, 2012.

**TABLE 60  
TYPICAL PROCESSING PROCEDURES BY PROJECT TYPE  
Placer County  
2012**

	Single Family Unit	Single Family Unit (Master Plan)	Subdivision**	Multifamily**
	Building Permit/Plan Check	Building Permit	Tentative Map	Site Plan and Design Review
			Initial Study/Mitigated or Negative Declaration	Categorical Exemption
			Final Map	Initial Study/Mitigated or Negative Declaration
			Development Agreement (optional)	Development Agreement (optional)
<b>Est. Total Processing Time</b>	<b>4 to 6 weeks</b>	<b>2 to 4 weeks</b>	<b>6 months to 2 years</b>	<b>6 months to 1 year</b>

Source: Placer County Planning Department, 2012.

## 6. Development Fees and Exactions

The County collects fees to help cover the costs of permit processing, environmental review, building inspections, and capital improvements. Fees collected by the County in the review and development process do not exceed the County's costs for providing these services. Fees charged for building permits are based on the construction values prescribed by the Uniform Building Code. The County collects capital improvement fees (impact fees) in accordance with California Government Code Sections 66000-66025 for the provision of services such as water, sewers, and storm drains. These fees are generally assessed based on the number of units in a residential development. When raising fees, the County complies with applicable provisions of the government code. Table 61 shows the major application-related fees according to the 2012 fee schedule for Placer County.

<b>TABLE 61 MAJOR FEES ASSOCIATED WITH NEW HOUSING DEVELOPMENT Placer County July 2012</b>	
Type of Fee	Amount
<b>Planning Review</b>	
Plan Check	Total Valuation x .0035
Building Permit	Total Valuation x .007
Inspection Fees (plumbing, elec., mech.)	Total Valuation x .001 for each
Conditional Use Permit	o Type A: \$3,997 minimum fee/deposit plus staff costs
Minor Use Permit	o Type A: \$2,988 o Type B: \$2,028 o Type C: \$1,991
Tentative Map	(four lots or less): \$1,361/lot (five lots or more): \$1,377 minimum fee/deposit plus staff costs +\$110/lot
Major Subdivision (50+ units)	Staff cost of project review
Design Review	o Type A: \$3,982 minimum fee/deposit plus staff costs o Type B: \$3,982 minimum fee/deposit plus staff costs o Type C: \$1,879 o Type D: \$742 o Single-Family Dwelling: \$225
<b>Annexation/Policy Changes</b>	
Variance	\$1,361
Minor Boundary Line Adjustment	\$871 per adjustment
Voluntary Merger	\$128
Minor Land Division	\$1,361 per resulting lot
General Plan Amendment	\$3,576 min. fee/deposit plus staff costs
Rezoning/Zoning Text Amendment	\$3,047 minimum fee/deposit plus staff costs
<b>Other</b>	
Appeals to Staff and Planning Commission	\$529
<b>Development Impact Fees</b>	
Fire Development Fees	Fees dependent upon location - set by local fire protection agencies in unincorporated Placer County
Sewer	o Single family dwelling hook-up fee: \$8,179 o Annexation Fee: \$1,500-6,344/acre o Single-family dwelling average user fee* = \$82 per month
Traffic Mitigation Fees	(See Table 61)
Park Fee	o Single-family dwelling: \$4,105 o Multi-family/Second Dwelling/Mobile Home: \$2,990 o Senior Dwelling: \$2,710 o Subdivision: \$655 per lot

Source: Placer County Fee Schedule, July 2012

\* Average fee based on service fees effective 11/10/11 for three sewer districts in the county.

The County waives 50 percent of the development fees (over which it has direct control) for residential projects that contain 10 percent of units affordable at the very low-income level, or 20 percent of units affordable at the low-income level. Service and mitigation fees, such as water, sewer, and school impacts, will be considered for waivers if an alternative source of funding is identified to pay these fees. However, service and mitigation fees, also known as capital improvement fees, are the largest component of residential development fees.

Residential development in the Tahoe Basin portion of the county is subject to additional TRPA fees. TRPA's filing fee schedule categorizes residential projects into two groups: single-family and multi-family new construction. Table 62 shows the base fees for the two groups of residential developments.

<b>TABLE 62 TRPA BASE FEES FOR NEW RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION Tahoe Basin Effective June 8, 2009</b>	
<b>Residential Use Category</b>	<b>Base Fee</b>
Single-family Dwelling, Summer Home, Secondary Residence, one Mobile Home Dwelling, and one Employee Housing unit	\$1 per sq. ft. of floor area \$5,000 cap. \$500 min.
Multiple Family Dwelling, Multiple Person Dwelling, Nursing and Personal Care, Residential-care, more than one Employee Housing unit, more than one Mobile Home Dwelling	\$2,200 + \$40/unit (extra unit cost does not apply to affordable housing) \$5,000 cap.

*Source: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Application Filing Fee Schedule, Effective June 8, 2009*

Depending on the required level of review (i.e., staff, hearing officer, or governing board review) and the location of the project, the total fee may be greater than the base fee. The majority of projects are reviewed at the staff level. The TRPA Hearings Officer or Governing Board generally only review residential projects identified as a "Special Use" in the applicable Plan Area Statement. Fees for revisions to the original plan are also determined by applying a multiplier to the original project fee. Table 63 summarizes TRPA's fee multipliers.

**TABLE 63  
TRPA FEE MULTIPLIERS**

**Tahoe Basin  
Effective June 8, 2009**

Level of Review	Multipliers
Staff Level Review	1.00
Hearing Officer Review	1.40
Governing Board Review	1.80
Plan Revisions	
Minor—A non-substantive change to a permitted project. A project that will not cause changes to any TRPA permit conditions, does not require new field review by TRPA staff, does not require a public hearing, and does not involve any modifications to building size, shape, land coverage, location, or scenic rating score.	0.40
Major— A substantial change that does not significantly exceed the original scope of the project. Revisions that significantly exceed the original scope of a project, or which require a public hearing, shall be treated as new or modified projects, as the case may be.	0.70
Special Planning Area	
For projects located in an adopted community plan area, or subject to an adopted redevelopment, specific, or master plan.	1.25

Source: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Application Filing Fee Schedule, Effective June 8, 2009

Projects are subject to other TRPA filing fees such as the \$88 I.T. surcharge applied to each application for maintenance of the TRPA database, and the \$400 Shoreland scenic review fee applied to projects located in the Shoreland area of Lake Tahoe. Table 64 lists these and other fees charged by TRPA in the land development process.

**TABLE 64  
OTHER TRPA FEES**

**Tahoe Basin  
Effective June 8, 2009**

Category	Fee
Shoreland Scenic Review Fee—For new construction projects, and additions and other construction modifications to existing structures located in the “shoreland” area of Lake Tahoe.	\$400 min. fee, deposit account
Information Technology (I.T.) Surcharge—applied to all applications	\$88
Bonus Unit Allocation Transfer	\$530
Land Coverage Transfer	\$530
Lot Line Adjustment	\$960 (2 lots) + \$100 per add. lot

Source: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Application Filing Fee Schedule, June 2009

In addition to the project application fees, mitigation fees are required by TRPA for all projects in the Lake Tahoe Basin. No exemptions for affordable housing are provided. These fees are the same for single-family or multiple family housing:

- **Water quality mitigation fee:** \$1.86 per square foot of land coverage;
- **Off-site land coverage mitigation fee:** \$8.50 to \$25 per square foot of coverage depending on watershed;
- **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	-	-	-	\$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	-	-	-	\$4,587

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. \$5,250 avg. based on 1500 sq. ft. residence	\$2-\$5/sq. ft. \$2,400 avg. based on 800 sq. ft. unit
Building Permit Fee	\$2,361 based on 1500 sq. ft. residence	\$1,461 based on 800 sq. ft. unit
County Traffic Fee	Low: \$3,227 High: \$6,833	Low: \$1,981, High: \$4,195
Fire Fee	\$.68/sq. ft. \$1,020 based on 1500 sq. ft. residence	\$.68/sq. ft. \$544 based on 800 sq. ft. unit
Facility Fee	\$33,683	\$2,684
Park Fee	\$4,105	\$2,990
Water (PCWA)- base connection	Low: \$9,927 High: \$14,414	Low: \$6,949 High: \$14,414
<b>TOTAL AVERAGE COST</b>	<b>\$41,788</b>	<b>\$29,688</b>

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

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 in-lieu 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 shared 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.

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

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.

Site improvements in the county consist of those typically associated with development for on-site 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.

<b>TABLE 67 STATEWIDE PARKING STANDARDS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING</b>	
<b>California 2007</b>	
<b>Number of Bedrooms</b>	<b>Number of On-Site Parking Spaces</b>
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 67.

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 lower 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.