

Housing Element Update – 10-30-20 Public Review Draft

Public Workshop #2 on 11-5-20 Questions and Answers

Housing Element Update Process	
Will the slides be available after the presentation?	Yes. Slides will be available on the County’s website: https://www.placer.ca.gov/6624/2021-Housing-Element-Update
I would like to receive a change control version of all of the draft changes. Will all public comments be included in the staff report to the Planning Commission and Board of supervisors? I am assuming these are open sessions.	They are open sessions. COVID restrictions change, but the public will either be able to participate in person or over Zoom. The Planning Commission will be receiving the same document that is publicly available; no changes will be made until after the Planning Commission and Board meetings.
Can we submit comments directly to HCD?	Comments on the Public Review Draft can be submitted to the County at spurvines@placer.ca.gov . This will allow the County to incorporate those comments directly. You would prefer to submit comments to HCD you may do so. HCD will see the comments provided.
Will HCD see the input?	
As a resident of unincorporated Placer County this impacts me greatly and our newly-elected Supervisor will not be in place until January. this should be postponed until our Supervisor is in office.	The current timeline for developing and adopting the Housing Element is required to meet the adoption deadline set by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). However, the County is working closely with the incoming Supervisor to familiarize them with the Housing Element and provide them with a copy of the Public Review Draft. The new Supervisor will be in place at the time that the vote for final adoption occurs.
The public voted the current supervisor in our District 4 out. We are requesting that the is process be postponed to respect the votes of our residents.	
There was a recent public workshop in person for the Hidden Falls expansion plan, so public meetings seem to be held on a discretionary basis not with social distancing constraints. The Board of Supervisors has physical meetings also. The Granite Bay gym is larger than the Board Room.	The County takes public health precautions regarding COVID-19 seriously and will continue to develop public outreach strategy in line with local public health recommendations for the safety of our community.
Will emails already submitted be included or do we need to re-email? for example, revising H-44 for Rent Stabilization Ordinances for mobile home parks versus rent control for apartments and homes?	E-mails already submitted will be included in communications to the Planning Commission and Board. If you would like to directly submit the comments to the Board or Planning Commission, you may also do that.
Where is the background report?	The background report is one section of the Housing Element document and can be found within the Draft available here along with any other background information: https://www.placer.ca.gov/6624/2021-Housing-Element-Update

<p>Will there be an errata sheet or other document describing the changes made by the Board of Supervisors in October regarding the requirements for residential and non-residential projects (10% inclusionary and \$2.00 per SF for non-residential)? Those changes need to be incorporated into the Housing Element so there is consistency between the County Code and Housing Element. Thanks!</p>	<p>There is a little clean-up necessary due to timing of the actions and Housing Element development, but the Housing Element and General Plan generally have general policies that support that. The ordinance itself is something that will be much more strategic and specific. The Board did not change the Specific Plan requirement or that policy, which is one that continued forward. They did make some modifications to the application for all new residential developments, including projects proposing General Plan amendments.</p>
<p>An update to the Placer County General Plan Community plan will need require an amendment. An EIR is required if zoning is becoming more restrictive. With an overlay the impacts need to be identified to Community plans which by Placer ordinance requires presentation to the MAC meetings. This has not occurred and needs to occur prior to the Planning Commission. Please comment on how you plan to accomplish this.</p>	<p>Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, presentations to Municipal Advisory Councils has been suspended. Invitations to participate in the community, PC and BOS workshops for the 2021-2029 Housing Element have been extended to MAC members. When MAC meetings are reestablished, staff will provide information on the 2021-2029 Housing Element Update upon request.</p>
<p>In your project timeline, it did not include review by the MACs prior to going to the planning commission. That step is required per current County code. How and why are you bypassing the community groups?</p>	
<p>We need at least 30 days to review.</p>	<p>The Public Draft Housing Element was released on October 30, 2020. The Planning Commission meeting occurred on November 12, 2020 and comments could be submitted up to the point of the meeting. The Board of Supervisors will vote on December 15, 2020 as to whether to approve submission of the document to HCD for its initial 60-day review. Comments will be provided to the Board. Comments may also continue to be submitted after the document is submitted to HCD for initial review.</p>
<p>When are comments due for the Planning Commission review?</p>	
<p>It was my understanding the public would have a month to review the background report and HE. There is too much information to adequately review these documents.</p>	
<p>Similar to a final EIR we want the ability to address the Housing Element before it goes to HCD. Please explain.</p>	<p>After the Board agrees to the Draft, later in December.</p>
<p>Reviewing your proposed timeline, when does Placer County anticipate submitting the updated Housing Element to the Airport Land Use Commission for a consistency determination/public hearing with the Placer County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan?</p>	
<p>I don't believe this plan is worthy of an eight year life as it is written. We need to</p>	<p>The Housing Element planning period is defined by HCD.</p>

<p>show ability for real and faster progress. We are in a deep hole, this doesn't build a single unit of housing. It is only a start.</p>	
<p>It doesn't seem like there is an opportunity to provide input to the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors input without the updated version.</p>	<p>Both the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors will have adoption hearings in the Spring of 2021 (dates pending). A Draft is available now, and the public may provide comments on it.</p>
<p>RHNA and the Sites Inventory</p>	
<p>Placer County has never met the targets in their RHNA goals. Will the new Housing Element address how to rectify this issue?</p>	<p>It is the intent of the General Plan, including the Housing Element, to meet the residents. The County's goal is to meet the housing need through its policies. The County's responsibility with regards to RHNA is not necessarily to directly construct new housing, but instead to identify land that would be sufficient to accommodate the development of this housing as is required by the State. As part of the Housing Element update the County also develops policies and programs to incentivize that development, reviews the existing regulations to identify any potential barriers to development, and identifies potential funding sources for new housing. Development and construction of housing is still conducted by private and non-profit developers.</p>
<p>Perhaps explain why the RHNA goals have never been met despite always having a requirement?</p>	
<p>Do the unmet RHNA numbers from the current Housing Element roll over into the next Element, or is it a zero-based number for each Element?</p>	<p>RHNA allocations are based on projections for each Housing Element planning period (in this case, 2021-2029), and do not roll over as long as sufficient sites are identified in the Housing Element.</p>
<p>What are Opportunity Sites?</p>	<p>As part of the Housing Strategy and Development Plan (2018, updated 2019) we updated Opportunity Sites, a mix of public and private lands that met certain criteria. If the site was of size and had few constraints and sufficient infrastructure, we would look to those sites first for future housing development. These sites are being included as potential sites for new housing development to meet the RHNA target. We have more Opportunity Sites identified than we will need for the RHNA.</p>
<p>What exactly is a High Resource area?</p>	<p>The California Tax Credit Allocation Committee (CTCAC) reviews factors such as employment, education, demographic and income trends as well as environmental risks. By creating an index using this information, CTCAC then categorizes each Census Tract on a scale from "High Segregation and Poverty" to "Highest Resource".</p> <p>For a more detailed description of the factors included,</p>

	<p>CTCAC’s 2020 methodology document is available here: https://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/opportunity/2020-ctcac-hcd-methodology.pdf</p>
<p>Is the County’s in-lieu fee program consistent with the County’s commitment to finally producing its fair share of affordable housing?</p>	<p>The in-lieu fee program is in support of that goal.</p>
<p>By-right approval for affordable housing on "previously identified sites"? Where are these sites?</p>	<p>According to State Law, for land in the Site Inventory that was included in the two previous Housing Elements, if a project comes in on those sites with at least 20% of its units as affordable, the project must be permitted by-right provided that they meet the existing zoning and development standards. There are a handful that have been carried forward for a third cycle of Housing Element update.</p>
<p>Sunset Area Plan/Placer Ranch is under litigation. Was the number included in RHNA numbers and if the county loses the suit. How do you plan on making up those numbers?</p>	<p>The Housing Element is on an eight-year cycle. We have assumed a low estimate for this project as a result of that possible delay. If the Placer Ranch site is not available, we would have to identify other Opportunity Sites due to the No Net Loss provision.</p>
<p>The focus seems to be on rezoning available land for new construction. What about redevelopment? Especially underutilized or vacant commercial sites?</p>	<p>We are looking at those now and talking with property owners. We have got some great examples in the North Tahoe area where those are being converted to micro units. There seems to be quite the demand for full-time housing there. We have not seen the same interest on the west side as the markets change. That is a new proposed policy in the Draft Housing Element.</p>
<p>In the RHNA baseline maps included in the draft document, there are properties identified that are being developed without affordable housing. The example I saw was at the intersection of Eureka and Sierra College Blvd. Shouldn’t this be removed then for your baseline housing inventory? Can you clarify how you identified the “inventory”?</p>	<p>That project was approved a while ago. At the time there was not a requirement for affordable housing. It would be removed from our site inventory if it continues with its current entitlements.</p>
<p>In the document you reference infill as part of your strategy. It seems that this could create a loophole for spot rezoning where higher density is allowed but affordable housing still isn’t required. I suggest adding parameters on infill development to restrict to affordable housing, along high use transit corridors with like land-use next to commercial, etc. The concern is that in rural areas, this opens up an ability for Res-</p>	<p>Generally speaking, when we look at infill, we’re trying to stay within the boundaries of the General Plan and other Specific Plan boundaries. As part of the inventory to meet our RHNA and the State law there may be some parcels that need to be rezoned or up zoned, which is separate from the infill strategy. Language will be added in the glossary to clarify that "infill" as defined will be consistent with California Public Resource Code Sections 21061.3, 21071 and 21072.</p>

<p>Ag properties to be developed as high density and there is no legal recourse.</p>	
<p>What percentage is the 8000 units needed, in relation to the number of units currently available in use?</p>	<p>The units identified in the RHNA allocation are additional units. While the number of units currently available is taken into consideration in the SACOG methodology for developing the allocation, existing units do not count toward the RHNA goals.</p>
<p>Transitional Housing on Property Owned by Churches or Non-Profits</p>	
<p>Is there a plan for allowing transitional housing for the homeless on church properties?</p>	<p>This was considered by the State in 2020 and will likely be considered again in the next legislative cycle. The County will continue to work with religious institutions on a case by case basis to consider what is allowed on site, including specific uses allowed by the base zone and any regulating use permit(s) to support housing options.</p>
<p>Has the County considered a zoning overlay that would allow churches and non-profits to construct affordable housing, and/or place FEMA trailers or tiny homes on their property? Pasadena is considering this and has 17 churches committed which will result in over 1,117 homes. State law pending is AB899 stuck in the House.</p>	
<p>Can the County allow churches rather than wait for the state?</p>	
<p>Reach out to Placer People of Faith Together to recruit churches with available land. PPOFT already has affordable housing as one of their supportive goals.</p>	
<p>Addressing Homelessness</p>	
<p>There's a firestorm raging in south Placer over the County buying up very expensive homes to house the homeless and paroled felons. The cost per person housed is thus astronomical. Why didn't you purchase more modest homes in order to house far more people? This seems like a tragic waste of dollars.</p>	<p>The Health and Human Service department is working to assist supportive housing by buying homes and then working with partners to provide small group care facilities within those homes. This is not actually part of the County strategy but is permitted under State Law (SB2), which allows private homes to be used as transitional housing.</p>
<p>Affordable Housing and Funding</p>	
<p>How will the fee-in-lieu funds collected so far be applied to building more affordable housing? What is the dollar total of fees collected so far?</p>	<p>The Board recently adopted a new in-lieu fee to go into effect in January 2021. Previously any in-lieu fees were negotiated on a project-by-project basis. The previously-collected \$2mil went into the affordable housing in the Government Housing Mercy Housing North (79 units) for 60% AMI and the remaining of those funds were used to help purchase an 11-acre site in the Dollar Hill acre of North Lake Tahoe. That site is identified to be a mixed-income site.</p>

Could a developer utilize the existing fees in-lieu of building very low income housing?	Payment of in-lieu fees is a permitted alternative to building affordable housing on-site, per section 15.65.190 of the County code.
Approximately 87% of Placer County’s tax-paying public qualifies for affordable housing. What percentage of new privately constructed housing under this plan will be produced for the 87%?	We do have a goal of 10% of all housing built going forward to be affordable and have other programs to help support affordability. Cumulatively, our goal is to meet the needs of the County residents.
Changes to Zoning	
There needs to be a clarification, i.e. specifics for infill and spot rezone. These should be enforceable so developers can’t just come in and say they are infill. The public should be allowed to identify these.	Infill housing is the development of housing within existing urbanized areas or underutilized sites rather than through development of greenfield sites. Objective Standards for infill development will be developed as part of program HE-5 of the Housing Element.
What’s the difference between infill and spot rezone within the Housing Element and will either of these be challengeable by the community?	
The County needs to refine their definition of senior housing projects and eliminate the loopholes of residential care homes for seven or more residents. Adoption of the Department of Social Services consistency and clarity should be included in the Housing Element policy.	We will review State law to ensure consistency.
If developers are not building why are the same developers offered additional rezones?	We are unclear on this, please contact County staff if you would like additional questions.
Redevelopment should be a major component! County should incentivize redevelopment via reduced permit fees and even property tax reductions. Other counties across the country do this.	Where we can rely on the built environment as much as possible to meet our housing needs, particularly in our east side, conversion adaptation and reuse is critical. Again, even on the west side it’s going to be an important component of our infill strategy. As for the fees, we did include that fee policy to incentivize redevelopment.
If redevelopment was part of your vision, I did not see it in the draft document. Please reference the page this is described where redevelopment areas are the first priority vs infill.	
Could you show the overlay?	No overlay has currently been determined. Program HE-1 includes the possible development of a Housing Opportunity Overlay Zone by May 2024; further public outreach will be conducted as this program is implemented.
Where is the overlay located and when is the public going to get to provide input?	
For the question that was just addressed, you mentioned that there is an overlay showing the possible locations for affordable housing. Where is this located? I only saw the RHNA inventory which my understanding is different. Can you clarify	

so I can review what's proposed as possible sites?	
When will the overlay be drafted? The public would like to be part of design.	
Accessory Dwelling Units	
Can sewer connections be partially funded and or deep discounts on our property taxes or prorated over a number of years like 15 years? Once connected, could additional sewer charges be waived? Could utility hookups like water and electric meters be subsidized? How about subsidized rent for (Section 8) for ADUs? The cottage on my property cost as much as my home to connect to sewer. I have room for another tiny home, but the infrastructure costs are prohibitive.	Those are great suggestions, and we will consider them in the Draft as we move forward.
Goal HC-3 assumes ADUs will count as affordable for low income. Please clarify why? They might not be used for affordable housing.	Some Accessory Dwelling Units can be used to meet affordable housing requirements. They are assumed to have a "natural affordability" due to the smaller size and lower cost to build, as well as the lack of land cost to construct.
Questions Related to Specific Developments	
Are you counting Bickford Ranch as 189 affordable units? How much will be received in in-lieu fees?	Bickford Ranch had a 10% inclusionary requirement. The Board did agree to an in-lieu fee for that, around \$4,000 per unit. We are not counting housing for Bickford Ranch as part of our inventory for this Housing Element.
What is the status of the Dollar Creek Crossing project?	That is currently with the County Facilities Department to do pre-development studies. We had up to six community meetings with the project developer and are working to respond to the input received. Early next year we are hoping to be able to have public meetings about designs and our analyses.
Are all the Dollar Creek Crossing units designated to a specific project or can other projects use them?	No units are designated to Dollar Creek. Under TRPA, there are some development rights on that site. As with all Tahoe-area sites, there is some ability to move those.
Does this plan close the loophole that allowed Placer Ranch to concentrate affordable housing units?	Placer Ranch is a Specific Plan that had a 10% affordable housing requirement in the specific plan. To some degree it does require that it not all be clustered, but higher density development does tend to cluster units within itself.
Mitigating Traffic Impacts	
For VMT traffic mitigation it appears that developers are being entitled if VMT is not analyzed. If there is a significant impact,	VMT is an emerging metric as part of our development review process. That was part of SB 743, which did not get implemented until July 1, 2020. Projects coming in

then developers should mitigate or build as zoned.	now need to start analyzing VMT as part of that process. The County is currently identifying thresholds and will clarify this in the housing element.
The Housing Element says VMT is more or less optional should explicitly state that it is required.	
Please engage Livermore or Alameda county for how they get around the influx of traffic per building project. Pretty successful along the 580 Corridor.	Thank you for your comment.
How does housing development coordinate its efforts with traffic flow and infrastructures? Roadways such as Hwy 65, IS 80, Auburn-Folsom west of Douglas, for example, are clogged.	There is an overall review of our transportation system as part the General Plan. We have a Capital Improvement Project plan that also reviews it, and it's reviewed with each project review.
Given the potential secondary environmental impacts on traffic and air quality with persons having to increasingly driving greater distances for work and affordable housing. When will affordable housing be considered as an environmental impact?	Placer County has identified affordable housing in its CEQA documents, but that would have to come down through the State.
Would Placer County consider car-free residential development proposals such as Culdesac Tempe currently planned outside Phoenix, Arizona? It would involve coordination with regional transit agencies.	Thank you for bringing that suggestion forward, we will take it into consideration.
Mobile Home Parks	
Is there an inventory of empty spaces in mobile home parks to discover if new units could be added and/or an inventory of available land in existing parks? Glenbrook Trails in Loomis has a few empty spaces and likely 1/2 acre of open space. However, it is currently owned by an LLC management company, not resident-owned.	That is something we can do but have not done that County-wide. This would only be for mobile home parks in the unincorporated County area. We have had conversations with mobile home parks in the unincorporated County. Previously the County owned a piece of land in one of these parks and in the past year sold it under the Surplus Land Act. We anticipate 24 low- and moderate-income units will be going onto that site. Some mobile home parks have constraints on water and sewer access so we cannot expand those parks yet. That program is included in the Housing Element.
Are there income categories available for mobile home parks? Can we get that info to support converting parks to resident owned? Also, could senior parks have priority? Do we have demographics by mobile home parks?	Mobile home demographics are not currently available.

<p>Was there a performance evaluation for what was D-6 supporting converting mobile-home parks from space rent to resident-owned? Are there qualifications for a park to meet to become part of this program?</p>	<p>No program has been done to date on that. We have received it as a program as part of this in response to some comments and have received some comments regarding adjusting some of that program language.</p>
<p>Other</p>	
<p>Is there a nexus between new commercial or employment generating project approvals and housing production? The County approved a project that will bring 850 new low wage workers to the County. Please address opportunities to address this disconnect.</p>	<p>The County does have a Housing Element to address it on the east side of the County for any non-residential development. As part of the Affordable Housing Accommodation Ordinance, we have recommended that this requirement be expanded to the west, but the Board requested additional public outreach prior to implementing this expansion.</p>
<p>On the use of existing resources, can the Housing Element include specific support for encouraging setting up and helping fund a system of Home Sharing? There are currently an estimated 77,000 empty bedrooms in Placer County.</p>	<p>We have worked with the Housing Stakeholder group to research other jurisdictions that have had success with this type of program. We have a basic outline and some guiding documents to establish that program. We have found that having an outside agency manage that program is important and are exploring partnerships to launch that program.</p>
<p>Is there any update on the co-housing project in North Auburn?</p>	<p>We are excited by that; we think it is a good fit for North Auburn. The consultant we are working with will be working directly with community members who may be interested. We are hoping it will be starting soon.</p>
<p>For properties served by independent sewer and water districts, what efforts has the County made to get the sewer and water hook-up fees reduced for affordable housing?</p>	<p>The County is working with them, particularly if they have sites identified as good sites for affordable housing. Most of those are located in public water and sewer districts. The County will be encouraging affordable housing incentives for any fees.</p>
<p>Are there public communications or targeted ones to local developers in order to advertise the opportunities in this County?</p>	<p>We are always looking to partner with developers we have worked with and are interested in identifying in expanding our resource list. We would love to talk to new developers to partner with.</p>