

13

POPULATION AND HOUSING

13.1 INTRODUCTION

The Population and Housing chapter of the EIR is intended to provide the reader with information regarding the effect of the proposed project on the population and available housing within the project area. Documents used to prepare this chapter include the Placer County General Plan,¹ the Placer County General Plan EIR,² the Dry Creek-West Placer Community Plan (DCWPCP),³ and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments' (SACOG) 2013-2021 Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP).⁴

13.2 EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The following section describes the current population and housing statistics for the DCWPCP area.

Project Site and Surroundings

The project site is located within an unincorporated portion of Placer County, to the west of the City of Roseville's Planning Area and north of the Sacramento County Line. Two single-family residential units are located on the project site, as well as multiple accessory structures such as greenhouses, outbuildings, barns, and sheds. In addition to the single-family units, one mobile home unit is currently located on the Ogg property; however, the mobile home has not been occupied since at least 2009, and because the unit is mobile, the unit is not considered a permanent residence within the project site. Thus, the mobile home is not further considered within this chapter of the EIR.

The site is bounded on the west side by Cook Riolo Road, the now-closed Dry Creek Elementary School, which is currently used as the Dry Creek Joint Elementary School District's (DCJESD's) offices and a community service station for the Placer County Sheriff's Office (PCSO), several residences, and the Willow Park subdivision on the west side of Cook Riolo Road. It should be noted that given that the 10-acre school property was recently put up for sale, the future of the site's use as the DCJESD's offices and PCSO community service station is uncertain. The eastern boundary of the project site includes a tributary to Dry Creek, south and east of which are industrial uses and vacant land. PFE Road forms the majority of the northern boundary of the project site, with the exception of the central portion of the project site, which is bordered to the north by rural residential dwellings and associated structures, where some agricultural operations occur. South

¹ Placer County. *Countywide General Plan Policy Document*. August 1994 (updated May 2013).

² Placer County. *Countywide General Plan EIR*. July 1994.

³ Placer County, Planning Services Division. *Dry Creek-West Placer Community Plan*. May 14, 1990.

⁴ Sacramento Area Council of Governments. *Regional Housing Needs Plan 2013-2021*. Adopted September 20, 2012.

of the project site, within Sacramento County, is a residential community (west of Antelope Road), and industrial uses (east of Antelope Road).

Development of the project area was planned for in the DCWPCP, which was adopted in 1990. Existing residential developments within the DCWPCP are predominantly single-family subdivisions, or rural residential developments.

Population and Housing

Information regarding housing characteristics within unincorporated portions of Placer County, including the DCWPCP is discussed below.

Historical and Current Population

The DCWPCP includes population projections for the Plan area until the plan horizon year of 2010. Population projections for the DCWPCP are based on three different growth rates. The lowest growth rate was assumed to be three percent, which was the growth rate throughout Placer County at the time that the DCWPCP was prepared, in 1990. The mid-range growth rate was based on the growth rate experienced by the City of Roseville between 1980 and 1988, which was six percent. Finally, the highest growth rate used in the DCWPCP was assumed to be the 10 percent growth rate that was occurring in the City of Roseville at the time that the DCWPCP was prepared. The three growth rates resulted in a range of projected populations as shown in Table 13-1.

Growth Rate (%)	Projected 2010 Population (residents)
3	3,400
6	5,550
10	9,836

Source: Placer County, Planning Services Division. Dry Creek West Placer Community Plan. May 14, 1990.

As shown in Table 13-2 the DCWPCP area’s observed population more than tripled between 1980 and 2010, adding approximately 3,647 new residents and 955 households.

Year	Population	Households	Persons Per Households
1980	1,378	700	1.97
2000	1,516	554	2.74
2010	5,025	1,655	3.03
2016	5,601	1,801	3.11

*Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File. Esri Converted Census data. April 06, 2017.
ESRI Business Analyst. April 06, 2017.
Placer County, Planning Services Division. Dry Creek West Placer Community Plan. May 14, 1990.*

Growth continued during the six-year period including 2010 and 2016, when roughly 576 residents and 579 new households were added to the DCWPCP area, which represents an 11 percent increase in population over that period.⁵ Despite the growth discussed above, compared to Placer County as a whole, from 1980 to 2010 the population of the DCWPCP area grew much more slowly than the county in general, which experienced a 50 percent increase in population during the same period.⁶

The observed population change within the DCWPCP, presented in Table 13-2, falls within the range of growth anticipated by the DCWPCP. In fact, the actual 2010 population of 5,025 residents within the DCWPCP area was close, but slightly below, the mid-range six percent growth rate scenario projected in the DCWPCP.

As shown in Table 13-2, the DCWPCP area’s population in 2016 was 5,601, which is slightly above the DCWPCP’s mid-range projection for the area’s population in 2010, but within the maximum growth scenario estimate within the DCWPCP for 2010. Therefore, while significant growth in the DCWPCP area has occurred since approval of the Plan, the area’s 2016 population is close to the population projected for the area for the year 2010.

Average Household Size

The average size of households is a function of the number of residents living in households within a given area divided by the number of occupied housing units within the given area. As shown in Table 13-3, average household sizes in California slightly increased between 2000 and 2010, with average household sizes increasing by approximately 0.03 residents. Concurrently, the average household size within Placer County decreased by an equivalent amount. Although Placer County as a whole experienced a decline in average household sizes, the DCWPCP experienced an increase in average household size by 0.37 persons per household over the decade between 2000 and 2010.

Table 13-3		
Average Household Size (Persons Per Household)		
Area	2000	2010
California	2.87	2.90
Placer County	2.63	2.60
DCWPCP	2.74	3.03
Sources:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Placer County. Housing Element: Background Report [pg. 15]. August 1, 2013.</i> • <i>U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File. Esri Converted Census data. April 06, 2017.</i> • <i>ESRI Business Analyst. April 06, 2017.</i> 		

The trend towards increasing average household sizes in the DCWPCP continued through 2016, with average person-per-household rates increasing from 3.03 to 3.11 (see Table 13-2).

⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File. Esri Converted Census data. April 06, 2017.

⁶ Placer County. *Placer County General Plan Housing Element 2013-2021*. August 1, 2013.

Vacancy Rate

In 2010, Placer County experienced an overall vacancy rate of 15.1 percent, which is higher than the statewide average of 8.1 percent. While the County’s overall vacancy rate of 15.1 percent is relatively high, the countywide vacancy rate includes units held vacant for seasonal or recreational uses, which are generally not open for long-term residential occupancy. Excluding the units held for seasonal or recreational uses, unincorporated portions of the County experienced a vacancy rate of 6.7 percent for units classified as for rent, for sale, or already rented or sold but not occupied. Placer County’s General Plan Housing Element considers a six percent vacancy rate for rental units and a two percent vacancy rate for owner-occupied units generally sufficient to keep prices down and ensure availability of units for new or relocating residents.⁷

The California Department of Finance reports that the overall vacancy rate within the County has decreased since 2010, to approximately 12.7 percent.⁸ Although data regarding the proportion of units kept vacant for seasonal or recreational uses in 2017 is not currently available, the proportion of such vacant units within the overall vacancy rate for the County is anticipated to be comparable to the proportion discussed above for the year 2010.

Within the DCWPCP area, the 2010 Census indicated that approximately 118 units were vacant, representing a vacancy rate of 6.5 percent. Vacant units within the DCWPCP during 2010 are presented in Table 13-4, below.

Table 13-4 DCWPCP Vacancy Rates		
Type of Housing Vacancy	Number of Vacant Units	Percent of Total DCWPCP Area Units (%)
For Rent	11	0.6
Rented, not Occupied	4	0.2
For Sale Only	44	2.5
Sold, not Occupied	10	0.6
For Seasonal / Recreational / Occasional Use	12	0.7
Other Vacant	37	2.1
Total Vacancy Rate	118	6.5
<i>Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File. Esri Converted Census data. April 06, 2017. ESRI Business Analyst. April 06, 2017.</i>		

Projected Population

As seen in Table 13-1 the population of the DCWPCP area was anticipated to experience a maximum growth scenario of 9,836 residents by 2010. While Table 13-2 demonstrates that growth within the DCWPCP did not reach the maximum growth scenario by 2010, the population within

⁷ Placer County. *Placer County General Plan Housing Element 2013-2021*. August 1, 2013.

⁸ California Department of Finance. *Report E-5: Population and Housing Estimates for Cities Counties and the State, January 1, 2011-2017, with 2010 Benchmark*. Released May 12 2017.

the DCWPCP is anticipated to continue to grow with buildout of the Plan, in particular due to the growth within the approved Placer Vineyards Specific Plan and Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan. SACOG has anticipated growth within the six-county Sacramento region through the 2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS).⁹

The MTP/SCS identifies the portion of the DCWPCP area not including the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan and Riolo Vineyards Specific Plan as one of the Established Communities within the MTP/SCS study area. As of 2016, Established Communities within Placer County included 16,143 housing units, and such communities are anticipated to grow to 16,772 units by 2020, 17,746 units by 2036, and 23,764 housing units at buildout.¹⁰ Buildout of the DCWPCP, including the project site, was included in the foregoing MTP/SCS growth estimates.

Regional Housing Needs Plan

The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is a minimum projection of additional housing units needed to accommodate projected household growth of all income levels by the end of the housing element's statutory planning period. Based on the adopted RHNA, each city and county must update the housing element of their General Plan to demonstrate how the jurisdiction will meet the expected growth in housing need over this period of time.

According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), housing is classified as "affordable" if households do not pay more than 30 percent of income for payment of rent (including utilities) or monthly homeownership costs (including mortgage payments, taxes, and insurance). SACOG adopted their Regional Housing Needs Plan (RHNP) on September 20, 2012, which officially assigns the allocations to cities and counties in the six-county Sacramento region. SACOG's RHNP covers the planning period from January 1, 2013 to October 31, 2021, and defines the lower income unit categories as follows:

- Low-Income Unit: is one that is affordable to a household whose combined income is at or between 50 and 80 percent of the median income.
- Very Low-Income Unit: is one that is affordable to a household whose combined income is at or lower than 50 percent of the median income.

The median family income for a four-person household in the six-county Sacramento region is \$76,000, as reported by the HUD for 2012.¹¹ According to SACOG's RHNP, Placer County's RHNA numbers for combined low and very low income level is 2,169 dwelling units (see Table 13-5).¹²

⁹ Sacramento Area Council of Governments. *2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy*. Adopted February 18, 2016.

¹⁰ Sacramento Area Council of Governments. *2016 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy* [Appendix E-3, pg. 159]. Adopted February 18, 2016.

¹¹ Placer County. *Placer County General Plan Housing Element 2013-2021*. August 1, 2013.

¹² Sacramento Area Council of Governments. *Regional Housing Needs Plan 2013-2021*. Adopted September 20, 2012.

Table 13-5 Placer County Regional Housing Needs Allocations by Income Category											
Jurisdiction	Total Units¹	Very Low Income		Low Income		Moderate		Above Moderate		Combined Low and Very Low	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Placer County Unincorporated Areas ²	4,703	1,275	27.1	894	19.0	875	18.6	1,659	35.3	2,169	46.1
Placer County Total	21,625	5,749	26.6	4,030	18.6	4,023	18.6	7,823	36.2	9,779	45.2

Note:
¹ Total number of units (based on proportion of Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy 2020 projection)
² Unincorporated areas presented in this table do not include the unincorporated areas within the Tahoe Basin.

Source: Sacramento Area Council of Governments Regional Housing Needs Plan, 2012.

For Placer county alone, the median household income in 2012 was \$76,100. Since 2012, median household incomes in Placer County have decreased slightly to \$75,200.¹³

The County General Plan Housing Element was updated and adopted on October 8, 2013, and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development on November 22, 2013.

Placer County has adopted several policies that require certain new development projects to contribute to the construction of affordable housing. The County currently requires 10 percent affordability for residential units in Specific Plan areas and other developments where a Community Plan and/or General Plan Amendment is approved that increases residential density on a site. Because the proposed project requires a land use designation change, 10 percent of the units are required to be affordable. The 10 percent affordability goal/standard would be guided by the following rules:

- 4 percent affordable to very low-income families;
- 4 percent affordable to low-income families; and
- 2 percent affordable to moderate-income families.

An applicant may build the units at the above affordability guidelines, pay an in-lieu fee, or provide a comparable affordable housing measure that is deemed acceptable by the County.

¹³ U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. *Income Limits*. Available at: <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/datasets/il.html#2017>. Accessed November 2017.

13.3 REGULATORY CONTEXT

The following is a description of State and local environmental laws and policies that are relevant to the CEQA review process concerning population and housing.

State Regulations

The following are applicable State regulations related to the proposed project.

Title 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15131

Title 14, California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15131 provides that economic or social information may be included in an EIR, but those economic or social effects shall not be considered significant effects on the environment. In an EIR, the lead agency is responsible for researching economic or social changes resulting from a project, which may eventually lead to physical changes in the environment. These economic or social changes can be used to determine the significance of physical changes on the environment.

Regional Housing Needs Plan

California General Plan law requires each city and county to have land zoned to accommodate a fair share of the regional housing need. The share is known as RHNA and is based on a RHNP developed by councils of government. The state-mandated RHNA process (Government Code Sections 65580 et seq.) requires SACOG to develop a methodology that determines how to divide and distribute an overall allocation that the region receives from the State.

Local Regulations

The following are applicable local regulations related to the proposed project.

Placer County General Plan

The following Goals and policies are from the 2013-2021 Housing Element of the Placer County General Plan.

- Goal A To provide new housing opportunities to meet the needs of existing and future Placer County residents in all income categories.

- Policy A-1 The County shall adopt programs and procedures with the intent of achieving its fair share regional housing allocation.

- Policy A-4 The County shall encourage innovative subdivision design and a range of housing types within larger-scale development projects to encourage mixed-income communities (e.g., single-family detached homes, second units, duplexes, live-work units).

- Policy A-8 The County shall evaluate the adoption of an inclusionary housing ordinance as a means of integrating affordable units within new residential development. This ordinance will identify acceptable methods to provide affordable housing, which will include the following:
- a. Construction of housing on site.
 - b. Construction of housing off-site.
 - c. Dedication of land for housing.
 - d. Payment of an in-lieu fee.
- Policy A-9 Housing for low-income households that is required in a new residential project shall be dispersed throughout the project, to the extent practical, given the size of the project and other site constraints.
- Goal B To encourage construction and maintenance of safe, decent, and sound affordable housing in the county.
- Policy B-12 The County shall require that any privately-initiated proposal to amend a General Plan or Community Plan land use designation of Agricultural/Timberland, Resort and Recreation, Open Space, General Commercial, Tourist/Resort Commercial, or Business Park/Industrial to a land use designation of Residential or Specific Plan include an affordable housing component.
- Policy B-14 The County shall consider requiring 10 percent affordable units, payment of an in-lieu fee, or comparable affordable housing measure(s) acceptable to the County, for any General Plan amendment that increases residential density.

West Placer Specific Plan Area

The DCWPCP identified the portion of the DCWPCP area west of Watt Avenue for future examination. During the Countywide General Plan Update, the area previously identified in the DCWPCP for future examination was designated as the West Placer Specific Plan Area, within the DCWPCP. The County identified the West Placer Specific Plan Area as an area for potential future urbanization with a mix of uses. Buildout of the West Placer Specific Plan Area was anticipated to include a maximum of 14,132 dwelling units, 160 acres of office and professional development, 80 acres of commercial areas, and up to 300 acres of professional/light industrial development, as well as various areas for public facilities. The DCWPCP was subsequently revised to reflect the establishment of the West Placer Specific Plan Area.

Following the establishment of the West Placer Specific Plan Area, the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan was approved by the County. The Placer Vineyards Specific Plan encompasses the West Placer Specific Plan Area, and includes future development of West Placer Specific Plan Area for residential, commercial, business/professional, and public facility uses.

Placer County Housing Program Work Plan 2017-18

On August 8, 2017, the Placer County Board of Supervisors approved a Housing Program Work Plan for unincorporated Placer County. The Housing Program Work Plan is a short-term, one-year, plan developed within the framework of the County's existing General Plan Housing Element. Key provisions of the Housing Program Work Plan include:

- Increase the availability of a mix of housing types in the county for existing and future residents, students, and employees whose income cannot support the cost of housing in the County;
- Improve the county's overall employment growth by assisting county employers in reducing critical labor shortages of skilled workers driven by a lack of available housing; and
- Reduce vehicle miles traveled by shortening commute distances for those who commute into Placer County for education or work, but who otherwise live elsewhere.

The Housing Program Work Plan includes specific tasks to be undertaken during the fiscal year of 2017-2018, and each task is clearly linked to a related Performance Goal from the County's Housing Element.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

SACOG is responsible for the preparation of, and updates to, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) for the region and the corresponding Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). The MTIP identifies short-term projects (seven-year horizon) in more detail.

Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

The 2016 MTP/SCS was adopted by the SACOG board on February 18, 2016.¹⁴ The MTP/SCS is a long-range plan for transportation improvements in the region and provides a 20-year transportation vision and corresponding list of projects. The plan is based on projections for growth in population, housing, and jobs. SACOG determines the regional growth projections by evaluating baseline data (existing housing units and employees, jobs/housing ratio, and percent of regional growth share for housing units and employees), historic reference data (based upon five- and ten-year residential building permit averages and historic county-level employment statistics), capacity data (General Plan data for each jurisdiction), and current MTIP data about assumptions used in the most recent MTP/SCS. SACOG staff then meets with each jurisdiction to discuss and incorporate more subjective considerations about planned growth for each area. Finally, SACOG makes a regional growth forecast for new homes and new jobs, based upon an economic analysis provided by a recognized expert in order to estimate regional growth potential based on market analysis and related economic data, which is incorporated into the MTP/SCS.

¹⁴ SACOG. 2016 *Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy*. Adopted February 18, 2016.

DCWPCP

The relevant goals and policies from the DCWPCP related to population and housing are presented below.

Population and Housing

- Goal Provide sound and adequate housing to all residents at desirable locations including consideration of transportation facilities, school facilities and proximity to major employment centers.
- Policy 1 Encourage residential development in areas which provide an adequate and accessible transportation network and which reduce commuting distances to areas of employment.
- Policy 3 Residential areas should be located where a full range of services and facilities can be provided most efficiently and economically.
- Goal Provide housing to meet future needs anticipated in current population projections for all economic segments anticipated within the plan area while ensuring consistency with existing land uses.
- Policy 1 Encourage innovative development techniques to assure a wide diversification of housing types.
- Policy 2 Limit high and medium density residential development to areas which have available public services and are compatible with surrounding land uses.
- Goal Provide safe, innovative and energy efficient residential developments.
- Policy 2 Encourage developments which create a sense of community by fostering human interaction through subdivision design, pathways, interconnecting trail systems, in-tract recreation opportunities, etc.
- Policy 4 The design of future residential developments should emphasize character, quality, livability and the provision of all necessary services and facilities to insure their permanent attractiveness.
- Policy 5 Encourage neighborhood design which fosters pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian traffic while still providing for safe automotive circulation.

Land Use

- Policy 8 Residential areas should be located where a full range of services and facilities can be provided most efficiently and economically.

- Policy 12 Where appropriate, higher-density housing (i.e., Sabre City) should be provided in sufficient quantity to meet Housing Element goals while retaining and preserving existing single-family residential neighborhoods.
- Policy 13 Ensure that the recommendations of the Housing Element are reflected in the Land Use Plan.

13.4 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following section describes the standards of significance and methodology used to analyze and determine the proposed project's potential impacts related to Population and Housing.

Standards of Significance

Consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the County's Initial Study Checklist, a significant impact would occur if the proposed project would result in any of the following:

- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- Conflict with Placer County's affordable housing policies and objectives.

Method of Analysis

The following section evaluates the potential for the project to result in population and housing impacts. The level of significance of the impacts is determined by evaluating whether the proposed project, either directly or indirectly, would induce substantial population growth in the area, or if the project would displace people or housing which would require the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The following discussion of population and housing impacts is based on implementation of the proposed project in comparison to existing conditions and the standards of significance presented above.

- 13-1 Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e., through extension of roads or other infrastructure). Based on the analysis below, the impact is *less than significant*.**

The proposed project site is located in an area of the DCWPCP, which is designated for residential, professional office, and industrial development. Buildout of the project site under existing land use designations would result in direct population growth through the

development of residential land uses and indirect inducement of population growth through the development of employment type land uses. The proposed project includes a request for rezoning and DCWPCP redesignation of the area from Low Density Residential (48.5 acres), Industrial (34.1 acres), Commercial (16.8 acres), and Greenbelt and Open Space (10.7 acres) to Medium Density Residential (88.3 acres) and Greenbelt and Open Space (21.8 acres).

Direct Population Growth

Based on a buildout of 308 residential units, and the DCWPCP's current rate of 3.11 persons per household,¹⁵ as identified in Table 13-2, the proposed project could generate an additional 958 new residents in the DCWPCP area ($308 \times 3.11 = 957.8$). Considering the DCWPCP's estimated 2016 population of 5,601 residents, such growth would result in a total population in the DCWPCP area of approximately 6,559 residents.¹⁶ Therefore, development of 308 residential units would result in population growth within the DCWPCP area. However, as discussed in the Existing Environmental Setting portion of this chapter, the DCWPCP projected that the area's population could grow to as much as 9,836 residents by 2010. Therefore, although the proposed project would have the potential to increase the population of the area to approximately 6,559 residents, such an increase in population would be within the growth projections used in the DCWPCP for the year 2010. Impacts associated with the growth anticipated in the DCWPCP area were analyzed in the EIR for the adopted DCWPCP.

It should be noted that while the anticipated population growth resulting from the proposed project would be within the maximum growth anticipated by the DCWPCP for 2010, the 2010 growth estimates within the DCWPCP do not include more recent projects approved in the DCWPCP, namely the Riolo Vineyard Specific Plan and the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan. Growth related to buildout of the foregoing Specific Plans is considered in further depth within Impact 17-12 of Chapter 17, Cumulative Impacts and Other CEQA Sections, of this EIR.

In addition to the growth anticipated in the DCWPCP, SACOG also anticipates growth within Established Communities, including the DCWPCP. As discussed within the Existing Environmental Setting section of this chapter, Established Communities throughout the unincorporated area of Placer County are anticipated to grow by 629 units between 2016 and 2020. The 308 units included in the proposed project would be within SACOG's growth estimates for Established Communities within Placer County by 2020. Additionally, growth in the DCWPCP Area and other unincorporated areas of Placer County was anticipated by the Placer County Housing Element. As shown in Table 13-5, the County's Housing Element includes allocation for market-rate, and below market-rate units within unincorporated portions of the county. The proposed 308 units would be within the Housing Elements' allocation of market-rate units for the county.¹⁷

¹⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2010 Summary File. ESRI Converted Census data. April 06, 2017.

¹⁶ ESRI Business Analyst. April 06, 2017.

¹⁷ Placer County. *2013-2021 Housing Element*. August 1, 2013.

Consequently, the proposed project would result in population growth of the DCWPCP area, but such growth would be within the buildout projections for the DCWPCP area, and within growth projections for unincorporated areas within Placer County.

Indirect Population Growth

The DCWPCP included measures to ensure that adequate utilities and services were provided for development within the DCWPCP area. In compliance with the DCWPCP, the proposed project would include on-site development of infrastructure to serve the proposed residences, as well as improvement of PFE Road along portions of the project frontage, and construction of an on-site sewer lift station and off-site wastewater conveyance system to the nearby Dry Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant (Dry Creek WWTP). Improvements to PFE Road would include expansion of PFE Road to accommodate additional lanes along portions of the project frontage, as anticipated by the DCWPCP (see the Project Description Chapter for more detail). As required by the County, the sewer lift station and off-site wastewater conveyance system would be sized to accommodate future development of the sewer shed including the proposed project site, as well as currently undeveloped areas to the north of the project site.¹⁸ The proposed improvements to PFE Road, the sewer lift station, and the wastewater conveyance infrastructure would be intended to service the project as well as other future development within the project area and the sewer shed. The foregoing infrastructure improvements would serve areas previously anticipated for development within the DCWPCP and analyzed in the DCWPCP EIR.

Physical environmental impacts associated with areawide development of new businesses and homes, made possible by constructing a sufficiently sized sewer system and improving PFE Road, have been evaluated in the DCWPCP EIR. As such, improvement of PFE Road and development of wastewater infrastructure would not allow for or encourage growth where such growth was not previously planned. Rather, the proposed project would include development as envisioned in the DCWPCP, which would meet the needs of future planned development within the area. The potential for the proposed project to result in growth-inducing impacts is further discussed in section 17.5 of Chapter 17 of this EIR.

Conclusion

Considering the above, the proposed project would include the development of housing units and infrastructure that would result in direct on-site population growth. However, population growth resulting from the proposed project would be within the DCWPCP, SACOG, and Placer County growth estimates for the project area. Furthermore, the infrastructure included in the proposed project would be sized to accommodate only the development that had been previously planned for the project area. As a result, the proposed project would not be considered to result in a substantial amount of population growth, and a *less-than-significant* impact would result.

¹⁸ TSD Engineering, Inc. *Providence Park Subdivision Preliminary Sewer Study*. August 30, 2016.

Mitigation Measure(s)

None required.

13-2 Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Based on the analysis below, the impact is *less than significant*.

As discussed above, the project site is located within the DCWPCP area, in an unincorporated portion of Placer County. The project site is predominantly vacant and used for agricultural purposes. Two permanent single family residential structures are located on the project site, as well as various ancillary structures. The proposed project would involve the demolition of the existing structures prior to the construction of 308 single-family units on the project site.

Using the 2016 persons per housing unit rate of 3.11,¹⁹ the demolition of existing on-site housing units included in the proposed project would only displace approximately 6 residents. In comparison to the existing developments within and surrounding the DCWPCP, two units and 6 residents would not be considered a substantial number of displaced units or residents, and displacement of 6 residents would not be considered a substantial number of residents. In addition, of the 1,947 housing units that exist in the DCWPCP area, approximately 118 are vacant (see Table 13-4), and, thus, available for rent or purchase as replacement housing for any residents currently residing on the project site.

Given the existing vacancies within the DCWPCP area, and surrounding communities, any residents of the existing on-site residential units that would be displaced as a result of the proposed project, would be able to find sufficient housing in the project area. Additionally, the proposed project would include the construction of 308 residential units, which would provide replacement housing on-site.

Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the displacement of a substantial number of housing units or residents, and the proposed project would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. As such, the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact related to the displacement of a substantial number of houses, and the need for construction of replacement housing.

Mitigation Measure(s)

None required.

13-3 Comply with Placer County's Affordable Housing requirements. Based on the analysis below, the impact is *less than significant*.

The proposed project would be subject to Placer County's affordable housing obligation, required by Policy B-14 of the Placer County General Plan Housing Element. Policy B-14 of the Housing Element requires that at least 10 percent of units within residential projects

¹⁹ ESRI Business Analyst. April 06, 2017.

in the County be affordable, or payment of in-lieu fees or establishment of a project specific affordable housing plan.

The proposed project is anticipated to include 308 market-rate residential units. To meet the County's affordable housing requirements and comply with County Policy B-14, the proposed project would include payment of Placer County in-lieu housing fees. The Placer County in-lieu affordable housing fee is subject to change, but was established at \$4,342 per residential building permit, with updates every July, based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the San Francisco/Oakland/San Jose area, published by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics from the CPI of the preceding 12 months. If at such time the County adopts the Western Placer County Nexus-Based Affordable Housing Fee Study (2016), and the adopted in-lieu fee as applied to this project is determined to be less, the applicant shall pay the lesser of the fees. If the applicant proposes an alternative affordable housing measure (i.e., construction of deed-restricted affordable housing units), the applicant shall submit an affordable housing plan to the County for review and approval that details how this alternative measure fulfills the Project's Affordable Housing obligation. The intent of the affordable housing fees is to generate additional affordable housing within the County, which would be available for all County residents, including those residents that may currently reside on the project site.

Considering that the proposed project would include payment of the County's in-lieu affordable housing fee, the proposed project would be in compliance with the County's affordable housing requirements, including County Policy B-14. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not cause any conflicts with the County's affordable housing requirements, and the proposed project would result in a *less-than-significant* impact.

Mitigation Measure(s)

None required.