



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development/Resource Agency

PLANNING
SERVICES DIVISION

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

Paul Thompson, Deputy Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Honorable Board of Supervisors

FROM: Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

DATE: June 4, 2013

SUBJECT: **SINGLE-ROOM OCCUPANCY RESIDENTIAL HOUSING – HOUSING ELEMENT IMPLEMENTATION**

ACTION REQUESTED

1. Conduct a public hearing to consider the proposed amendments to County Code Chapter 17 pertaining to Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing and associated amendments to County Code Chapter 15, Article 15.04,
2. Adopt the Revised Negative Declaration prepared for the Single-Room Occupancy Zoning Text and Building and Construction Codes Amendments, and
3. Adopt an Ordinance amending Placer County Code Chapter 17 (Zoning Ordinance), Articles 17.04, 17.06, 17.20, 17.22, 17.26, 17.30, 17.34, 17.48, and 17.56 pertaining to Single-Room Occupancy Housing in order to implement State housing law and the County's Housing Element, and
4. Adopt an Ordinance amending Placer County Code Chapter 15 (Building and Construction Codes), Article 15.04, to add Section 15.04.127 pertaining to local revisions to the standards for Efficiency Dwelling Units in order to implement State housing law and the County's Housing Element.

There is no net County cost associated with these actions.

BACKGROUND

The proposed Zoning Text Amendment is intended to implement State Housing Law for Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) housing and the County's Housing Element Program G-4. The proposed amendment to the Zoning Ordinance would add definitions for SRO housing. SRO complexes with 30 or fewer units would be allowed by zoning clearance (I.E., by right) in the HS (Highway Service) and RES (Resort) zoning districts, and with a Minor Use Permit in those same districts for complexes with over 30 units. Approval of a Minor Use Permit would be required in RM (Residential Multi-Family), and C1 (Neighborhood Commercial) for all SRO developments, regardless of size. Approval of a Conditional Use Permit would be required in C2 (General Commercial) and CPD (Commercial Planned Development) for all size SRO developments.

While preparing these zoning text amendments staff determined that there may be inconsistencies with the new SRO development standards and the standards for "Efficiency Dwelling Units" under the California Building Code, which is adopted by reference and amended to reflect local conditions in Placer County Code Chapter 15, Article 15.04. Therefore, staff also proposes revisions to the Building Code standards for

"Efficiency Dwelling Units" to assure consistency with the standards proposed for "Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) Housing" and "Development Standards".

Single-Room Occupancy Housing Regulations

In 2007, the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) issued a memorandum clarifying Senate Bill (SB) 2 regarding zoning requirements for housing. Chapter 633, Statutes of 2007 (SB) 2 clarifies and strengthens State Housing Element law to ensure local zoning ordinances encourage and facilitate the development of a variety of housing types with units affordable to all segments of the County's population including single-room occupancy housing units.

To address State law concerning Single-Room Occupancy Housing Units, the following program was added to the County Housing Element and adopted by the Board of Supervisors:

Program G-4: Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) Housing Units

The County shall amend the Zoning Ordinance to define Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) housing 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.

To be consistent with SB 2 mandates, SRO units need to be treated as residential units and would be subject to similar development and management standards that apply to residential uses within the same zone district.

In order to comply with State housing law and implement programs and policies of the County's Housing Element, staff has proposed to revise the Zoning Ordinance to define SROs and to allow for SRO facilities to operate as a permitted use in at least one zoning district and may allow it as a conditionally permitted use in other zoning districts.

Placer County Zoning Ordinance

Currently, the Placer County General Plan and Zoning Ordinance do not explicitly address SROs. Under current zoning code "hotels and motels" and "dwelling" or "dwelling units" are defined as follows:

"Hotels and motels" means guest room or suites, provided with or without meals or kitchen facilities, rented to the general public for overnight or other temporary lodging (generally less than thirty days).

"Dwelling" or "dwelling unit" means one or more habitable rooms that are designed and/or used as independent living space for one family, with facilities for living, eating and sleeping, with not more than one kitchen ((except that two kitchens are allowed where the habitable floor area of the dwelling is eight thousand (8,000) square feet or larger)), and at least one bathroom, and where all such habitable areas have access to each other from within the building.

"Multifamily dwellings" means and includes a building or a portion of a building used and/or designated as residences for two or more families living independently of each other. Includes: halfplex structures, duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes and apartments (five or more units under one ownership in a single building; common ownership, attached unit projects such as condominiums and townhouses; and rooming and boarding houses (single dwellings where bedrooms are rented to five or more people and at least one common meal is offered each day).

Based on the Housing Element Program G-4 and the language set forth in SB 2, staff is proposing amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed language is provided in Attachments 1 and 2 and is discussed below. The proposed changes to the Zoning text follow California Health and Safety Code Section 17958.1 and are shown as underlined.

PROPOSED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENTS SUMMARY

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would add a definition for Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing Units, also known as SROs.

“Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) Housing” means any building containing five or more units 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 residents which is their primary residence. The individual units may lack either cooking facilities or individual sanitary facilities, or both and shall meet currently adopted California Building Code R-2 occupancy classification requirements.

The amendments propose that SROs with 30 units or fewer would be allowed in the Highway Service (HS) and Resort (RES) zoning districts with Zoning Clearance, and SROs with over 30 units would be allowed with a Minor Use Permit. For all sized SROs in the Residential Multi-Family (RM), Neighborhood Commercial (C1), a Minor Use Permit is required (requiring review by the Zoning Administrator). For all sized SROs in the General Commercial (C2) and Commercial Planned Development (CPD), a Conditional Use Permit is required (requiring review by the Planning Commission).

Development Standards and Business Practices

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would also add a new section for development standards designed to ensure the orderly development of and/or conversion to Single-Room Occupancy Housing Units. The standards include provisions for unit size, kitchen and bathroom facilities, on-site management, lighting, parking, and proximity to other SROs. Proposed language for such a section is provided below.

Add new Section 17.56.233 Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing

When allowed by Sections 17.06.030 et seq., (Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements) in the zone applicable to a site, a Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing (SRO) at a fixed location is subject to the requirements of this section. The provisions of this Chapter are intended to provide opportunities for the development of permanent, affordable housing for small households and for people with special needs in proximity to transit and services, and to establish standards for these small units.

- A. Location. Single-Room Occupancy residential housing shall not be located within three hundred (300) feet of any other Single-Room Occupancy residential housing, emergency shelter, or other similar program, unless such program is located within the same building or on the same lot.
- B. Development Standards.
 1. Units shall have a minimum floor area of 150 square feet and a maximum floor area of 400 square feet.
 2. Each unit shall accommodate a maximum of two persons.
 3. Provide adequate exterior security lighting.
 4. Laundry facilities shall be provided in a separate room at the ratio of one washer and one dryer for every 20 units of fractional number thereof, with at least one washer and dryer per floor.
 5. Cleaning Supply Room. A cleaning supply room or utility closet with a wash tub with hot and cold running water shall be provided on each floor of the SRO facility.
 6. Bathroom. An SRO unit may contain partial or full bathroom facilities; however, provisions of in-unit bathroom facilities are not required. A partial bathroom facility shall have at least a toilet and sink; a full facility shall have a toilet, sink and bathtub or shower or bathtub/shower combination. If a full bathroom facility is not provided, common bathroom facilities shall be provided in accordance with the California Building Code for congregate residences with at least one full bathroom per floor.
 7. Kitchen. An SRO unit is not required to but may contain partial or full kitchen facilities. A full kitchen includes a sink, a refrigerator and stove, range top or oven. A partial kitchen

is missing at least one of these appliances. If a full kitchen is not provided, common kitchen facilities shall be provided with at least one full kitchen per floor.

8. Closet. Each SRO unit shall have a separate closet.
9. Code Compliance. SRO units shall comply with all requirements of the California Building Code. All units shall comply with all applicable accessibility and adaptability requirements. All common areas shall be fully accessible.

C. Business Practices.

1. Facility Management. An SRO Facility with 10 or more units shall provide on-site management. An SRO Facility with less than 10 units may provide a management office on-site.

D. Parking. Off-street parking for tenants shall be provided based upon a demonstrated need; however, the parking standard shall not require more parking than for other residential or commercial uses within the same zone. A SRO facility shall provide one parking space for each SRO unit, one parking space for the on-site manager where required, and one parking space for each additional employee. All parking shall be off-street and on-site.

E. Tenancy. Tenancy of SRO units shall be limited to 30 or more days.

F. Existing Structure. An existing structure may be converted to an SRO facility, consistent with the provisions of this Section. Any such conversion must bring the entire structure up to current building code standards, including accessibility and adaptability standards, unless otherwise exempted by the Chief Building Official.

MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEW

Staff presented the proposed Zoning Text Amendments to 12 Municipal Advisory Committee as either an Information or Action Item. A summary of the results of each meeting and comments received is provided in Attachment 4. In general, the MACs were supportive of the SRO concept, although the following concerns/issues were identified:

- Concern that the densities might be too high
- Concern that, if not maintained, the SRO projects could impacts adjacent properties
- Concern that SROs not become a magnet for released criminals and other non-desirable groups

PLANNING COMMISSION HEARINGS

On September 27, 2012, staff presented the proposed Zoning Text Amendment to the Planning Commission. The item was tabled by a 6-0-0-0 vote (Commissioner Sevison was absent) to allow staff to further research a number of issues that were raised by the Commission. Those issues included:

Difference Between SROs and Rooming/Boarding Houses

The Planning Commission wanted clarification regarding the difference between SROs and Boarding Houses. SRO's and Rooming/ Boarding Houses are similar in that each is a type of "non-traditional" permanent housing. The major difference is SRO's are individual units that may or may not have bathroom and or kitchen facilities in the unit, while Rooming and Boarding Houses provide bedrooms for long-term occupancy with common bathroom and kitchen facilities utilized by the residents.

Rooming and Boarding Houses are currently described in the Zoning Ordinance definition for "Multifamily Dwelling" as "single dwellings where bedrooms are rented to five or more people and at least one common meal is offered each day. The boarding of four or fewer renters is not considered to be a land use different from a single-family dwelling."

To provide clarification between the two uses, the Planning Commission directed staff to add a new stand-alone definition for Rooming and Boarding Houses to the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

“Any building, or dwelling, or portion thereof with access provided through a common entrance, for the renting of individual bedrooms to five or more people with a property owner or other manager in residence. Boarding of four or fewer renters is not considered to be a land use different from a single-family dwelling.”

There is no proposed change on where Rooming and Boarding houses are allowed. These uses would continue to be allowed with the same discretionary review as required for multi-family dwellings.

The proposed Zoning Text Amendment sets development standards for SROs that do not apply to Rooming and Boarding Houses, including but not limited to unit size, occupancy caps, and the provision of bathroom, kitchen and laundry facilities.

Zoning Districts for SRO Complexes

Members of the Planning Commission expressed a desire to not allow SRO complexes in the Residential Multi-Family (RM) zoning district. Staff had previously recommended that SRO’s with 30 or fewer units be allowed by right in the RM district with a Zoning Clearance. Since SRO’s by definition are a form of multi-family housing, the County could not exclude these types of units in the RM district. Staff is now recommending that SRO complexes of any size obtain a Minor Use Permit (MUP) in the RM district.

Staff and the Commission discussed which zoning districts are likely to have requests for SRO units. The consensus was that new SRO construction is possible in the Sierras as a form of workforce housing. SROs are more likely to involve conversion of an existing hotel or motel to SRO occupancy. Based upon an analysis of Assessor Code data, existing hotels and motels are found in the following zoning districts:

Zone District	No.of Hotels/Motels	Tahoe Basin:	
		Zone District	No.of Hotels/Motels
C1	2	Commercial	8
C2	4	Commercial Tourist	2
CPD	2	Tourist	18
F	1	Residential	14
FOR	2	Special Area	10
HS	9	Entry Commercial	20
Mixed-Use	3	High Density Residential	1
RA	1	Village Commercial	3
RE	1		
RES	3	Total:	76
RES-Ds	1		
RF	1		
RM	10		
ROW	1		
RS	4		
W	1		
Total:	46		

The Planning Commission recommended the County allow SROs by right in those districts where Hotels and Motels are currently allowed and exist. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment has been modified so that SROs with 30 or fewer units be allowed in the Highway Service (HS) and Resort (RES) districts with Zoning Clearance (C). Staff is also recommending that SROs complexes of any size obtain a Minor Use Permit in the RM district, in Neighborhood Commercial (C1) with a Minor Use Permit and in General Commercial (C2) and Commercial Planned Development (CPD) with a Conditional Use Permit. The requirements in these commercial districts match what is currently required of multifamily dwellings in the same zoning districts.

The table below shows where multi-family dwellings and hotels and motels are allowed and the corresponding permit requirements. Also shown is the proposed zoning requirements for SRO units in those districts.

LAND USE TYPES	RESIDENTIAL				COMMERCIAL						INDUSTRIAL				AGRICULTURAL, RESOURCE, OPEN SPACE						
	RS	RM	RA	RF	C1	C2	C3	CPD	HS	OP	RES	AP	BP	IN	INP	AE	F	FOR	O	TPZ	W
Residential Uses																					
Multifamily Dwellings (20 or fewer units)		C			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										
Multifamily Dwellings (21 or more units)		MUP			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										
Single-Room Occupancy Residential Units (30 or fewer units)		<u>MUP</u>			<u>MUP</u>	<u>CUP</u>		<u>CUP</u>	<u>C</u>		<u>C</u>										
Single-Room Occupancy Residential Units (31 or more units)		<u>MUP</u>			<u>MUP</u>	<u>CUP</u>		<u>CUP</u>	<u>MUP</u>		<u>MUP</u>										
Transient Lodging																					
Hotels and Motels						MUP	MUP	CUP	MUP		MUP	MUP	MUP	CUP	CUP						

Key To Permit Requirements	
Allowed use, zoning compliance required (Section 17.06.050)	A
Zoning Clearance required (Section 17.06.050)	C
Administrative Review Permit required (Section 17.06.050)	ARP
Minor Use Permit required (Section 17.06.050)	MUP
Conditional Use Permit required (Section 17.06.050)	CUP
Permit requirements set by Article 17.56	*
Use not allowed	

As noted in the Assessor code data above, there are currently 76 hotels or motels in the Tahoe Basin which utilized Planning Area Statements and not zoning. An update to the Tahoe Basin Community Plan that is currently underway will address construction of new SRO complexes and conversion of existing hotels and motels in the basin to SRO facilities. It is anticipated that SROs would be allowed in similar commercial and multi-family districts as found in the balance of the County.

Provision of Bathroom and Kitchen Facilities

The Planning Commission also suggested staff investigate establishing a standard for bathroom and kitchen facilities per SRO unit. The California Building Code contains standards for bathroom facilities. The requirement is based upon occupancy types and occupancy loads (persons) proposed. There is not a Building Code standard for kitchen facilities in SROs. The Code only states that "common kitchens shall be designed to allow for clear floor space and clear width." Building Services Division staff concluded that the bathroom facility standards are clear and that applicants be given the flexibility to propose common kitchen facilities that they anticipate demand for in their complex. At the time of an SRO proposal, Building Services Division staff will work with the Planning staff and others to determine whether sufficient bathroom/kitchen facilities are provided.

On December 20, 2012, staff returned to the Planning Commission after considering and incorporating the Commission's comments into the proposed amendment. At that meeting, the Commission unanimously adopted a motion (7-0-0-0) to recommend the Board of Supervisors adopt the Negative Declaration as prepared for the Single Room Occupancy Housing Zoning Text Amendments and adopt an Ordinance amending the Placer County Zoning Ordinance as presented. No members of the public spoke at this hearing.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION CODE AMENDMENTS

Based on the Planning Commission recommendations, staff determined that revisions were needed to the California Building Code standards for "efficiency dwelling units", which is the building code equivalent designation for an "SRO". Section 1208.4 of the California Building Code limits the two person occupancy of an efficiency dwelling unit to a minimum floor area of 220 square feet. To allow the Building Services Division to process building permit applications for an "SRO" consistent with the proposed zoning text amendments, the minimum square foot occupancy requirement had to be reduced to 150 feet. An additional revision ensures that the efficiency dwelling unit includes a "functioning" cooking appliance. California Health and Safety Code Section 17958.1 authorizes the County to adopt an ordinance to permit an efficiency unit for occupancy by no more than two persons with a minimum floor area of 150 square feet. A revision to the Negative Declaration was prepared to incorporate this additional proposed ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Board of Supervisors take the following actions:

1. Adopt the Revised Negative Declaration prepared for the two proposed County Code ordinances pertaining to Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, based upon the following findings:
 - A. The Revised Negative Declaration has been prepared as required by law. The Project is not expected to cause any significant adverse impacts.
 - B. There is no substantial evidence in the record as a whole that the project will have a significant effect on the environment.
 - C. The Revised Negative Declaration for the project reflects the independent judgment and analysis of Placer County, which has exercised overall control and direction of its preparation.
 - D. Pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15072.5(c), the revisions to the Negative Declaration do not require reposting of the environmental document.

- E. The custodian of records for the project is the Placer County Planning Director, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn CA, 95603.
2. Adopt an Ordinance amending Placer County Code Chapter 17 (Zoning Ordinance), Articles 17.04, 17.06, 17.20, 17.22, 17.26, 17.30, 17.34, 17.48, and 17.56 pertaining to Single Room Occupancy Housing in order to implement State housing law and the County's Housing Element based on the following finding:
- A. The proposed Zoning Text Amendment related to Single-Room Occupancy housing is consistent with the Placer County General Plan and implements the following General Plan Housing Element policy:
- Program G-4: Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) Housing Units**
The County shall amend the Zoning Ordinance to define Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) housing 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.
3. Adopt an Ordinance amending Placer County Code Chapter 15 (Building and Construction Codes), Article 15.04, to add Section 15.04.127 pertaining to Efficiency Dwelling Units based on the following findings:
- A. The proposed Placer County Code Ordinance amendments are consistent with State housing law and the County's Housing Element Program G-4.
- B. California Health and Safety Code Section 17958.1 authorizes the County to adopt an ordinance that permits efficiency units for occupancy by no more than two persons which have a reduced minimum floor area of 150 feet and which may also have partial kitchen or bathroom facilities as specified by ordinance. Findings pursuant to Health and Safety Code Section 17958.5 of local conditions are not required to adopt said ordinance.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment 1 – Ordinance amending Placer County Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 17
Attachment 2 – Ordinance amending Placer County Code, Chapter 15
Attachment 3 – Revised Negative Declaration
Attachment 4 – MAC Meeting Summary
Attachment 5 – Correspondence

cc: Paul Thompson - Deputy Director of Planning
Karin Schwab - County Counsel
Rebecca Taber - Engineering and Surveying Division
Laura Rath - Environmental Health Services
Tim Wegner - Chief Building Official
Kathie Denton - Health and Human Services
All MACs

Before the Board of Supervisors County of Placer, State of California

In the matter of:

Amendments to Placer County Code
Chapter 17, Articles 17.04, 17.06,
17.20, 17.22, 17.26, 17.30, 17.34,
17.48, and 17.56 pertaining to
Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing

Ordinance No.: _____

The following Ordinance was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held _____, by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Attest:

Clerk of said Board

Chair, Board of Supervisors

Clerk of the Board Signature

Chair

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Chapter 17, Article 17.04, Section 17.04.030 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended as follows:

17.04.030 Definitions of land uses, specialized terms and phrases.

~~“Boarding House. See “Multifamily dwellings.” “~~

“Boarding and Rooming House” means any building, or dwelling, or portion thereof with access provided through a common entrance, for the renting of individual bedrooms to five or more people with a property owner or other manager that resides in the residence. Boarding of four or fewer renters is not considered to be a land use different from a single-family dwelling.

“Multifamily dwellings” (land use) mean and include: (1) a building or a portion of a building used and/or designed as residences for two or more families living independently of each other; or (2) two or more detached single-family dwellings on a single lot where all of the single-family dwellings and the lot are under common ownership, provided that one of the units is not a secondary dwelling. Includes halfplex structures (a halfplex is a single dwelling unit that is half of a two-unit building where a property line separates the two units), duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes (detached buildings under one ownership with two, three or four dwelling units (respectively) in the same building) and apartments (five or more units under one ownership in a single building); common ownership, attached unit projects such as condominiums and townhouses; and rooming and boarding **and rooming houses (single dwellings where bedrooms are rented to five or more people and at least one common meal is offered each day **See “Boarding and Rooming House” under Section 17.04.030 for definition**). ~~The boarding of four or fewer renters is not considered to be a land use different from a single-family dwelling.~~**

“Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) Housing” means any building containing five or more units 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 residents which is their primary residence. The individual units may lack either cooking facilities or individual sanitary facilities, or both and shall meet currently adopted California Building Code R-2 occupancy classification requirements.

Section 2. Chapter 17, Article 17.06, Section 17.06.050 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended as follows:

Section 17.06.050, Land Use and permit tables.

LAND USE TYPES	RESIDENTIAL				COMMERCIAL							INDUSTRIAL				AGRICULTURAL, RESOURCE, OPEN SPACE					
	RS	RM	RA	RF	C1	C2	C3	CPD	HS	OP	RES	AP	BP	IN	INP	AE	F	FOR	O	TPZ	W
Residential Uses																					
Caretaker and employee housing (Section 17.56.090)					C	C	MUP	C	C	C	MUP	C	MUP	C	C	MUP	MUP	MUP		MUP	
Emergency Shelter, 30 or less (Section 17.56.295)		C			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										
Emergency Shelter, 31 or more (Section 17.56.295)		MUP			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										
Farmworker Dwelling Unit (Section 17.56.095)			A	A												A	A	A		A	
Farmworker Housing Complex (Section 17.56.095)			A	A												A	A	A		A	
Home occupations (Section 17.56.120)	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C	C			C	
Mobile home parks (Section 17.56.140)		CUP			CUP	CUP															
Mobile homes (Section 17.56.150)	C	C	C	C							C					C	C				
Multifamily dwellings, 20 or fewer units		C			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										
Multifamily dwellings, 21 or more units		MUP			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										
Residential accessory uses (Section 17.56.180)	C	C	C	C	C	C		CUP			C	C	MUP			C	C				
Residential care homes, 6 or fewer clients	C	C	C	C							C						C				
Residential care homes, 7 or more clients		MUP	MUP														MUP				
Secondary dwellings (Section 17.56.200) (Ord. 5126-B required ARP)	C	C	C	C							C					C	C				
Senior housing projects (Section 17.56.210)		CUP			CUP	CUP		CUP	CUP												
Single-family dwellings (Section 17.56.230)	C	C	C	C							C					C	C				
<u>Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing (30 or fewer units)</u>		MUP			MUP	CUP		CUP	C		C										
<u>Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing (31 or more units)</u>		MUP			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										
Storage, Accessory (Section 17.56.250)
Supportive Housing 30 or fewer units		C			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										
Supportive Housing 31 or more units		MUP			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										
Temporary dwelling (Section 17.56.280)			C	C							C			C		C	C			C	
Temporary dwelling - hardship/disaster (Section 17.56.290)
Transitional Housing 30 or fewer units		C			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										
Transitional Housing 31 or more units		MUP			MUP	CUP		CUP	MUP		MUP										

Key To Permit Requirements	
Allowed use, zoning compliance required (Section 17.06.050)	A
Zoning Clearance required (Section 17.06.050)	C
Administrative Review Permit required (Section 17.06.050)	ARP
Minor Use Permit required (Section 17.06.050)	MUP
Conditional Use Permit required (Section 17.06.050)	CUP
Permit requirements set by Article 17.56	.
Use not allowed	

Section 3. Chapter 17, Article 17.20, Section 17.20.010 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended as follows:

Commercial Planned Development (CDP)

B. Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements. The following land uses are allowed in the CPD zone district as provided by Sections 17.06.030 et seq., (Allowable land uses and permit requirements), subject to the land use permit shown for each use, any applicable specific standards, and all other applicable provisions of this chapter. See also subsection C of this section for permit requirements where a proposed site is to be subdivided.

ALLOWABLE LAND USES	LAND USE PERMIT	SPECIFIC STANDARDS IN SECTION
Residential Uses		
Caretaker and employee housing	C	17.56.090
Emergency Shelter, 60 or fewer clients	CUP	17.56.295
Emergency Shelter, 61 or more clients	CUP	17.56.295
Home occupations	C	17.56.120
Multifamily dwellings, any size	CUP	17.20.010
Residential accessory uses	CUP	17.56.180
Senior housing projects	CUP	17.56.210
<u>Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 30 or fewer units</u>	<u>MUP</u>	<u>17.56.233</u>
<u>Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 31 or more units</u>	<u>MUP</u>	<u>17.56.233</u>
Supportive Housing 60 or fewer clients	CUP	
Supportive housing, 61 or more clients	CUP	
Transitional Housing 60 or fewer clients	CUP	
Transitional Housing 61 or more clients	CUP	

Section 4. Chapter 17, Article 17.22, Section 17.22.010 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended as follows:

General Commercial (C2)

B. Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements. The following land uses are allowed in the C2 zone district as provided by Sections 17.06.030 et seq., (Allowable land uses and permit requirements), subject to the land use permit shown for each use, any applicable specific standards, and all other applicable provisions of this chapter.

ALLOWABLE LAND USES	LAND USE PERMIT	SPECIFIC STANDARDS IN SECTION
Residential Uses		
Caretaker and employee housing	C	17.56.090
Emergency Shelter, 60 or fewer clients	CUP	17.56.295
Emergency Shelter, 61 or more clients	CUP	17.56.295
Home occupations	C	17.56.120
Mobile home parks	CUP	17.56.140
Multifamily dwellings, any size	CUP	17.20.010
Residential accessory uses	C	17.56.180
Senior housing projects	CUP	17.56.210
<u>Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 30 or fewer units</u>	CUP	17.56.233
<u>Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 31 or more units</u>	CUP	17.56.233
Supportive Housing 60 or fewer clients	CUP	
Supportive housing, 61 or more clients	CUP	
Transitional Housing 60 or fewer clients	CUP	
Transitional Housing 61 or more clients	CUP	

Section 5. Chapter 17, Article 17.26, Section 17.26.010 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended as follows:

Highway Service (HS)

B. Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements. The following land uses are allowed in the HS zone district as provided by Sections 17.06.030 et seq., (Allowable land uses and permit requirements), subject to the land use permit shown for each use, any applicable specific standards, and all other applicable provisions of this chapter.

ALLOWABLE LAND USES	LAND USE PERMIT	SPECIFIC STANDARDS IN SECTION
Residential Uses		
Caretaker and employee housing	C	17.56.090
Emergency Shelter, 60 or fewer clients	MUP	17.56.295
Emergency Shelter, 61 or more clients	MUP	17.56.295
Home occupations	C	17.56.120
Multifamily dwellings, any size	MUP	17.20.010
Senior housing projects	CUP	17.56.210

ALLOWABLE LAND USES	LAND USE PERMIT	SPECIFIC STANDARDS IN SECTION
<u>Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 30 or fewer units</u>	<u>CUP</u>	<u>17.56.233</u>
<u>Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 31 or more units</u>	<u>CUP</u>	<u>17.56.233</u>
Supportive Housing 60 or fewer clients	MUP	
Supportive housing, 61 or more clients	MUP	
Transitional Housing 60 or fewer clients	MUP	
Transitional Housing 61 or more clients	MUP	

Section 6. Chapter 17, Article 17.30, Section 17.30.010 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended as follows:

Neighborhood Commercial (C1)

B. Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements. The following land uses are allowed in the C1 zone district as provided by Sections 17.06.030 et seq., (Allowable land uses and permit requirements), subject to the land use permit shown for each use, any applicable specific standards, and all other applicable provisions of this chapter.

ALLOWABLE LAND USES	LAND USE PERMIT	SPECIFIC STANDARDS IN SECTION
Residential Uses		
Caretaker and employee housing	C	17.56.090
Emergency Shelter, 60 or fewer clients	MUP	17.56.295
Emergency Shelter, 61 or more clients	MUP	17.56.295
Home occupations	C	17.56.120
Mobile home parks	CUP	17.56.140
Multifamily dwellings	MUP	17.30.010(D)
Residential accessory uses	C	17.56.180
Senior housing projects	CUP	17.56.210
<u>Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 30 or fewer units</u>	<u>MUP</u>	<u>17.56.233</u>
<u>Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 31 or more units</u>	<u>MUP</u>	<u>17.56.233</u>
Supportive Housing 60 or fewer clients	MUP	
Supportive housing, 61 or more clients	MUP	
Transitional Housing 60 or fewer clients	MUP	
Transitional Housing 61 or more clients	MUP	

Section 7. Chapter 17, Article 17.34, Section 17.34.010 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended as follows:

Resort (RES)

B. **Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements.** The following land uses are allowed in the RES zone district as provided by Sections 17.06.030 et seq., (Allowable land uses and permit requirements), subject to the land use permit shown for each use, any applicable specific standards, and all other applicable provisions of this chapter.

ALLOWABLE LAND USES	LAND USE PERMIT	SPECIFIC STANDARDS IN SECTION
Residential Uses		
Caretaker and employee housing	MUP	17.56.090
Emergency Shelter, 60 or fewer clients	MUP	17.56.295
Emergency Shelter, 61 or more clients	MUP	17.56.295
Home occupations	C	17.56.120
Mobile homes	C	17.56.150
Multi-family dwellings	MUP	
Residential accessory uses	C	17.56.180
Residential care homes, 6 or fewer clients	C	
Secondary dwellings (<i>Ord. 5126-B req'd ARP</i>)	C	17.56.200
Single-family dwellings	C	17.56.230
Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 30 or fewer units	C	17.56.233
Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 31 or more units	MUP	17.56.233
Supportive Housing 60 or fewer clients	MUP	
Supportive housing, 61 or more clients	MUP	
Temporary dwelling	C	17.56.280
Transitional Housing 60 or fewer clients	MUP	
Transitional Housing 61 or more clients	MUP	

Section 8. Chapter 17, Article 17.48, Section 17.48.010 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended as follows:

Residential Multi-Family (RM)

B. Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements. The following land uses are allowed in the RM zone district as provided by Sections 17.06.030 et seq., (Allowable land uses and permit requirements), subject to the land use permit shown for each use, any applicable specific standards, and all other applicable provisions of this chapter.

ALLOWABLE LAND USES	LAND USE PERMIT	SPECIFIC STANDARDS IN SECTION
Residential Uses		
Emergency Shelter, 60 or fewer clients	C	17.56.295
Emergency Shelter, 61 or more clients	MUP	17.56.295
Home occupations	C	17.56.120
Mobile home parks	CUP	17.56.140
Mobile homes	C	17.56.140
Multifamily dwellings, 20 or fewer units	C	
Multifamily dwellings, 21 or more units	MUP	
Residential accessory uses	C	14.56.180
Residential care homes, 6 or fewer clients	C	
Residential care homes, 7 or more clients	MUP	
Secondary dwellings (<i>Ord. 5126-B</i>)	C	17.56.200
Senior housing projects	CUP	17.56.210
Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 30 or fewer units	MUP	17.56.233
Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing, 31 or more units	MUP	17.56.233
Single-family dwellings	C	17.56.230
Supportive Housing 60 or fewer clients	C	
Supportive housing, 61 or more clients	MUP	
Transitional Housing 60 or fewer clients	C	
Transitional Housing 61 or more clients	MUP	

Section 9. Chapter 17, Article 17.56, Section 17.56 of the Placer County Code is hereby amended to add Section 17.56.233, which will read as follows:

Section 17.56.233 Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing

When allowed by Sections 17.06.030 et seq., (Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements) in the zone applicable to a site, a Single-Room Occupancy

Residential Housing facility (SRO) at a fixed location is subject to the requirements of this section. The provisions of this Chapter are intended to provide opportunities for the development of permanent, affordable housing for small households and for people with special needs in proximity to transit and services, and to establish standards for these small units.

A. Location. A Single-Room Occupancy residential housing facility shall not be located within three hundred (300) feet of any other Single-Room Occupancy residential housing, emergency shelter, or other similar program, unless such program is located within the same building or on the same lot.

B. Development Standards.

1. Units shall have a minimum floor area of 150 square feet and a maximum floor area of 400 square feet.
2. Each unit shall accommodate a maximum of two persons.
3. Provide for adequate exterior security lighting.
4. Laundry facilities shall be provided in a separate room at the ratio of one washer and one dryer for every 20 units of fractional number thereof, with at least one washer and dryer per floor.
5. Cleaning Supply Room. A cleaning supply room or utility closet with a wash tub with hot and cold running water shall be provided on each floor of the SRO facility.
6. Bathroom. An SRO unit is not required to but may contain partial or full bathroom facilities. A partial bathroom facility shall have at least a toilet and sink; a full facility shall have a toilet, sink and bathtub or shower or bathtub/shower combination. If a full bathroom facility is not provided, common bathroom facilities shall be provided in accordance with the California Building Code for congregate residences with at least one full bathroom per floor.
7. Kitchen. An SRO unit is not required to but may contain partial or full kitchen facilities. A full kitchen includes a sink, a refrigerator and stove, range top or oven. A partial kitchen is missing at least one of these appliances. If a full kitchen is not provided, common kitchen facilities shall be provided with at least one full kitchen per floor.
8. Closet. Each SRO unit shall have a separate closet.
9. Code Compliance. SRO units shall comply with all requirements of the California Building Code. All units shall comply with all applicable accessibility and adaptability requirements. All common areas shall be fully accessible.

C. Business Practices.

1. Facility Management. An SRO facility with 10 or more units shall provide on-site management. An SRO facility with less than 10 units may provide a management office on-site.

- D. Parking. Off-street parking for tenants shall be provided based upon a demonstrated need; however, the parking standard shall not require more parking than for other residential or commercial uses within the same zone. A SRO facility shall provide one parking space for each SRO unit, one parking space for the on-site manager where required, and one parking space for each additional employee. All parking shall be off-street and on-site.**
- E. Tenancy. Tenancy of SRO units shall not be for less than 30 days.**
- F. Existing Structure. An existing structure may be converted to an SRO facility, consistent with the provisions of this Section. Any such conversion must bring the entire structure up to current building code standards, including accessibility and adaptability standards, unless otherwise exempted by the Chief Building Official.**

Section 10. This ordinance shall take effect and be in full force thirty (30) days after the date of its passage. The Clerk is directed to publish this ordinance, or a summary thereof, within fifteen (15) days in accordance with government code section 25124.

Before the Board of Supervisors County of Placer, State of California

In the matter of:

Amendments to Placer County Code
Chapter 15, Article 15.04 to add
Section 15.04.127 Pertaining to
Efficiency Dwelling Units

Ordinance No.: _____

The following Ordinance was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held _____, by the following vote on roll call:

Ayes:

Noes:

Absent:

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Attest:

Clerk of said Board

Chair, Board of Supervisors

Clerk of the Board Signature

Chair

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE COUNTY OF PLACER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DOES HEREBY ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Placer County Code, Chapter 15, Article 15.04 is hereby amended to add Section 15.04.127, which will read as follows:

15.04.127 Efficiency Dwelling Units.

Section 1208.4 "Efficiency dwelling units [HCD 1]" is modified as follows:

1. The unit shall have a living room of not less than 220 square feet (20.4 m²) of floor area **minimum floor area of not less than 150 square feet**. An additional 100 square feet (9.3 m²) of floor area shall be provided for each occupant of such unit in excess of two.
2. The unit shall be provided with a separate closet.
3. The unit shall be provided with a kitchen sink, **functioning** cooking appliance and refrigeration facilities, each having a clear working space of not less than 30 inches (762 mm) in front. Light and ventilation conforming to this code shall be provided.

4. The unit shall be provided with a separate bathroom containing a water closet, lavatory and bathtub or shower.

Section 2. The above amendment is authorized by California Health and Safety Code Section 17958.1.

Section 3. This Ordinance shall take effect and be in full force and effect thirty (30) days after final passage. The Clerk is directed to publish this Ordinance, or a summary thereof, within fifteen (15) days in accordance with Government Code Section 25124.



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
 Agency Director

**ENVIRONMENTAL
 COORDINATION
 SERVICES**

E. J. Ivaldi, Coordinator

NEGATIVE DECLARATION (Revised)

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: Single-Room Occupancy – Amendments to Placer County Code Chapter 17 (Zoning Ordinance) and Chapter 15 (Building Ordinance) – Housing Element Implementation	Plus# PZTA 20110258
Description: The project proposes to revise the Placer County Code (Zoning Ordinance) to bring the Code into compliance with State housing law for single-room occupancy hotels and to amend Placer County Code Chapter 15 (Building Ordinance) pertaining to Efficiency Dwelling Units.	
Location: Unincorporated Placer County	
Project Applicant: Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603	
County Contact Person: Christopher Schmidt	530-745-3076

PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closed on **September 6, 2012**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the County's web site <http://www.placer.ca.gov/Departments/CommunityDevelopment/EnvCoordSvcs/NegDec.aspx>, Community Development Resource Agency public counter, and at the Tahoe City and Auburn Public Libraries. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Environmental Coordination Services, at (530)745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, please visit our Tahoe Office, 775 North Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96146.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.

41



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

E. J. Ivaldi, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3003 • www.placer.ca.gov/planning

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST (Revised)

The Initial Study & Checklist was posted for a 30-day public review from August 7, 2012 to September 6, 2012. Subsequent to the public posting period, it was determined that an Amendment to Placer County Code Chapter 15, Article 15.04, pertaining to Efficiency Dwelling Units was required to accommodate the Zoning Text Amendment to Placer County Code Chapter 17 to allow for Single-Room Occupancy Residential Housing.

These changes, made on May 10, 2013, do not affect the level of impacts or the conclusions discussed in the document. Pursuant to CEQA Guideline Section 15073.5(c), the changes do not require reposting of the environmental document. The hearing body must confirm this determination as part of their findings to approve the proposed project.

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Title: Single-Room Occupancy – Amendments to Placer County Code Chapter 17 (Zoning Ordinance) and Chapter 15 (Building Ordinance) – Housing Element Implementation	Plus# PZTA 20110258
Entitlements: Zoning and Building Text Amendment	
Site Area: Countywide	APN: Various
Location: Unincorporated Placer County	

Project Description:

The project proposes to revise the Placer County Code (Zoning Ordinance) to bring the Code into compliance with State housing law for single-room occupancy hotels and to amend Placer County Code Chapter 15 (Building Ordinance) pertaining to Efficiency Dwelling Units. The proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments will implement

Housing Element Program G-4. The amendments are summarized below and Attachment A provides specific language for the amendments.

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would add a definition for Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) Residential Hotels and specify which zoning districts they would be permitted.

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would allow SRO complexes with 30 or fewer units with an Administrative Review Permit (ARP) in the Residential Multi-Family (RM) district. A Minor Use Permit (MUP) would be 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.

The proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance would also add a new section for development standards. A summary of these standards is provided below.

1. Minimum size of 150 square feet, maximum of 400 square feet, and maximum of two persons.
2. Laundry facilities must be provided.
3. Bathroom. An SRO unit is not required to but may contain partial or full bathroom facilities. If a full bathroom facility is not provided, common bathroom facilities shall be provided in accordance with the California Building Code for congregate residences with at least one full bathroom per floor.
4. Kitchen. An SRO unit is not required to but may contain partial or full kitchen facilities. If a kitchen is not provided, at least one common full kitchen must be provided per floor.

The proposed amendment to Placer County Code Chapter 15 (Building Ordinance) would modify the definition of Efficiency Dwelling Units, also known as SRO units, to conform to the new Zoning Ordinance section for development standards.

No specific housing projects are approved as part of these zoning text amendments. In fact, these amendments, in themselves, would not directly result in changes to the physical environment (environmental effects). After the zoning text amendments are adopted, the County will evaluate specific housing development proposals based on their compliance with the General Plan, relevant Community Plans, Zoning Ordinance, and other ordinances. Additional environmental review of potential environmental effects in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act may be required prior to development of any specific SRO housing project.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Placer County is a geographically diverse county. While the western portion of the County contains suburbs of the Sacramento Region, the eastern portion lies within the Lake Tahoe Region. Placer County is one of the fastest growing counties in the state. Between 2000 and 2010, the County's population grew from 248,399 to 348,432. The 2009 Housing Element discusses and provides Program G-4 to address SRO housing for the County.

C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference will occur:

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR
- ➔ Community Plans

Section 15183 states that "projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional

environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site." Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or will be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division Office, 775 North Lake Boulevard, Tahoe City, CA 96145.

D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including "No Impact" answers.
- b) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
 - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
 - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)				X
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance would add and revise the definition for single room occupancy residential hotel but does not identify the location and type of new development. Therefore, it is not possible to anticipate how development of SRO housing will potentially impact the existing visual character of unincorporated areas of the County. To ensure that significant impacts to aesthetic resources do not occur, future development of special needs housing uses will be in accordance with applicable County standards and guidelines, as well as the requirements mandated during the environmental review of individual projects.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (PLN)				X
4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

Adopting the zoning text and building amendments will not by itself convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract. A land inventory analysis undertaken in Section II of the Housing Element showed the County has sufficient properly zoned land capacity to accommodate SRO housing on non-agricultural land.

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (APCD)				X
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (APCD)				X
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (APCD)				X
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (APCD)				X
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (APCD)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed zoning text and building amendments does not revise, replace or attempt to supersede existing standards and procedures to ensure compliance with State and County codes and policies that pertain to Air Quality. Individual future SRO housing projects will be subject to supplemental environmental review as required by State law and County policy.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)				X
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)				X
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				X

9/6

6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)				X
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)				X
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance would add a definition for single room occupancy residential hotels but does not identify the location and type of new development and therefore will not affect biological resources. Potential biological impacts associated with construction of SRO housing would vary on a project-by-project basis. Each development project would be subject to separate environment review at the time a specific development proposal is made, and project-specific biological constraints (e.g., presence of rare/endangered species, locally designated species or habitats) would be further assessed at that time in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)				X
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance would add a definition for single room occupancy residential hotels but does not identify the location and type of new development and therefore it is not possible to determine potential impacts to cultural (historic and archeological) resources.

Review of new special needs housing development(s) will permit an analysis of how such development may potentially conflict with cultural resources. Adherence to applicable County, State, and Federal standards and guidelines related to the protection/preservation of cultural resources, as well as the requirements mandated during the environmental review of individual projects will be implemented when a future project is proposed.

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)				X
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)				X
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)				X
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)				X
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)				X
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)				X
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)				X
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)				X
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance would add a definition for single room occupancy residential hotels but does not identify the location and type of new development and therefore it is not possible to determine the impact to geologic and soil conditions. Potential geologic impacts associated with the construction of new SRO housing would vary on a project-by-project basis. Each development project would be subject to separate environmental review at the time a specific development proposal is made, and project-specific geologic constraints (e.g., potential for fault rupture, ground shaking, ground failure, subsidence, expansive soils, etc.) would be evaluated at that time.

VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)				X

3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD)				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)				X
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)				X
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance will not create concerns regarding hazards or hazardous materials. Future SRO housing development in the county will be subject to hazardous materials regulations and would be required to meet fire safe guidelines. Project-specific health hazards will be evaluated at the time a specific development proposal is made.

VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)				X
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)				X
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)				X
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)				X
7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)				X

8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)				X

Discussion- All Items:

All future development will be subject to site-specific environmental studies as determined appropriate by the County and will comply with all applicable County policies related to hydrology and water quality. Any new SRO housing development project would be subject to separate environmental review at the time a specific development proposal is made, and project-specific hydrologic impacts (e.g. changes in drainage patterns, increased surface runoff, flood hazards, water quality degradation, etc.) would be evaluated as part of this review.

IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)				X
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				X
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance would add a definition for single room occupancy residential hotels but does not identify the location and size of new development. Amending the zoning and building

ordinance does not grant entitlements for any projects. The proposed zoning and building ordinance amendments are required to implement the County General Plan Housing Element Program G-4 and to comply with State housing law.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

Adopting the proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance will not by itself substantially result in the loss of the availability of mineral resources, particularly mineral (minerals include several different types of aggregate that are used for purposes other than petroleum) resources. All future SRO housing development proposals will be analyzed for specific project impacts to mineral resources.

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (PLN)				X
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)				X
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)				X
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance would add a definition for single room occupancy residential hotels but does not identify the location and size of new development and therefore will not affect noise conditions. Potential noise impacts associated with construction and occupation of SRO housing would vary on a project-by-project basis. The County's existing Noise Ordinance (Article 9.36 of the County Code) would apply to proposed SRO housing developments and each development project would be subject to separate environmental review at the time a specific development proposal is made; project-specific noise impacts or constraints would be evaluated at that time.

xii. population & housing – **WOULD THE PROJECT:**

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)? (PLN)				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

Adopting amendments to the zoning and building ordinance will not by itself induce substantial population growth in unincorporated Placer County. Implementation of the Housing Element Programs is designed to address the special needs housing forecasted for unincorporated Placer County for the 2006-2013 planning period. Without specific details regarding future developments, it is impossible to evaluate inducement of population growth. Through the County's environmental review process, future development projects would be evaluated for potential growth inducing impacts. No aspect of the project involves the displacement of existing housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
2. Sheriff protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Schools? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
5. Other governmental services? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance will not change residential land use designations within the Land Use Element of the Placer County General Plan and / or Community Plan and, therefore, would not cause an increase in demand for public services. All future SRO housing developments will be subject to site-specific environmental studies as determined appropriate by the County, and will comply with all applicable County policies and regulation related to public services.

102

XIV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				X
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance do not grant entitlements for any projects. It will not change residential land use designations in the Land Use Element of the Placer County General Plan and, therefore, would not cause an increase in demand for recreational facilities. All future development will be subject to site-specific environmental studies as determined appropriate by the County, and will comply with all applicable County policies and regulation related to recreational services.

XV. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)				X
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)				X
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)				X
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)				X
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)				X
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				X
7. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (ESD)				X
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (ESD)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance will not directly affect transportation facilities or traffic conditions. The nature and extent of local traffic impacts would vary on a project-by-project basis. Project-specific traffic impacts (e.g., level of service operation, access, traffic or pedestrian safety hazards, etc.) would be evaluated

113

when such proposed project plans are submitted to the County. Project-specific traffic impacts will be evaluated at the time a specific development proposal is made.

XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)				X
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)				X
3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS)				X
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)				X
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)				X
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)				X
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws? (EHS)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance would add a definition to single-room occupancy residential hotels but does not identify the location and type of new development and therefore would not increase the demands on existing utilities and services systems. It is impossible to determine utility and service system requirements of future development without identified site locations and specific project details. Future utility and service system needs will be evaluated on an ongoing basis as each new SRO facility is proposed.

XVII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant and/or cumulative impact on the environment? (PLN AQ)				X
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (PLN AQ)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance do not grant entitlements for any projects. Since no development is anticipated at this time, the specific effects to greenhouse gas emissions would be speculative at this time.

104

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially impact biological resources, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

Discussion- All Items:

The proposed amendments to the zoning and building ordinance would add a definition for single room occupancy residential hotels but does not identify the location and size of new development. Accordingly, these changes do not authorize specific SRO housing development projects for specific sites. Housing projects undertaken in the course of implementing the revised ordinance will be subject to project-specific environmental review in accordance with Section 10562 et seq. of the CEQA Guidelines. Any indirect impacts associated with future special needs housing construction have already been addressed in the Placer County General Plan EIR and various community plan EIRs.

F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES whose approval is required:

<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

G. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Services Division, Christopher Schmidt, Chairperson
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Rebecca Taber
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Wastewater, Janelle Heinzler
 Department of Public Works, Transportation, Andrew Gaber
 Environmental Health Services, Laura Rath
 Air Pollution Control District, Angel Rinker
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
 Facility Services, Parks, Andy Fisher
 Placer County Fire/CDF, Bob Eicholtz/Brad Albertazzi

105



Signature _____ Date August 6, 2012
 E.J. Ivaldi, Environmental Coordinator

I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES:

The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8 am to 5 pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division Office, 775 North Lake Boulevard, Tahoe City, CA 96145.

County Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan(s)	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2009 Housing Element	
Trustee Agency Documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Site-Specific Studies	Planning Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting and Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey and Arborist Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Engineering & Surveying Department, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater and Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan

106

Single-Room Occupancy Residential Hotel ZTA Initial Study & Checklist continued

		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Air Pollution Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Emission and Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> URBEMIS Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>
	Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic and Circulation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/>
Mosquito Abatement District	<input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Developments	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	

MAC	DATE	SRO ZTA MAC ACTION/SUMMARY
North Auburn	7/10/12	No action; no comments
Sheridan	7/11/12	Action: Recommended approval. Comments/Issues: How was 150 sq.ft. minimum established
NTRAC	7/12/12	ACTION: Recommend denial of ZTA until explored further and presented to and vetted by Community Plan teams and then returned to the NTRAC for further consideration Comments/Issues: Would allow for too much density; legalizes "slums" – Falcon Lodge as example; needs to be further explored, and more restrictive; want more photos of what they look like; needs to be flushed through CP update process; enforcement concerns; 30 days still too transient
Horseshoe Bar	7/17/12	No action; no comment
Weimar/Applegate/Colfax	7/18/12	Action: 1: to abstain from taking any action on the staff recommendation – motion failed vote (2-3) Action: 2: to approve staff recommendations, vote (3-2)
Newcastle/Ophir	7/19/12	No action Comments/Issues: Zoning maps of eligible parcels should be placed online
Penryn	7/24/12	No action Comment: SRO will result in halfway houses, convicted felons; child molesters; major concern with Orchard at Penryn site – this is the only RM

Attachment C

		zoned site in Penryn; explore alternate zoning district where allowed by right.
Meadow Vista	8/1/12	No action; no comment. Don't foresee SRO's being built in MAC area
Granite Bay	8/1/12	
Squaw Valley	8/2/12	No action; comment – clarification requested on where units could be allowed and if property could be rezoned for this purpose
Foresthill	8/6/12	
Rural Lincoln	8/20/12	

Attachment D

County of Placer
WEIMAR/APPLEGATE/COLFAX
MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

County Contact: Administrative Aide (530) 889-4010



RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd COB CoCo
TSI _____ CEO _____ Other _____

August 07, 2012

AUG 08 2012

Subject:

WAC MAC Advisory to the Board of Supervisors

Sup D1 _____ Sup D4 _____ Aide D1 _____ Aide D4 _____
Sup D2 _____ Sup D5 _____ Aide D2 _____ Aide D5 _____
Sup D3 _____ Aide D3 _____
WACMAC FILE

On July 18th, 2012 the WAC MAC voted 4 to 2 (Wiltsee and Gagnon dissenting) to support staff recommendation for Single Room Occupancy Zoning Text Amendment.

The majority of MAC members felt that the proposal was a good fit for areas likely to be affected by the proposed amendment.

Sincerely

Donald Adams, Chairman

Maywan Krach

Attachment D

From: Chuck-Muriel Davis [chamdavis@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2012 8:09 AM
To: Christopher Schmidt
Cc: Catherine Donovan; Crystal Jacobsen; Maywan Krach
Subject: Re: ZTA Questions--comments on the SRO & FH

Hi Chris,

Thanks for the clarification.

I believe that since the SRO is only required in one zoning district, the planning department is going overboard in proposing that SROs be allowed in RM districts. The planning department could abide by the law and conservatively propose only the Resort & Highway zoning areas.

These SRO units are NOT at all similar in any way to apartments, which by default have bathrooms and kitchens. These SROs are appropriate for the resort zoning because of the need in resort areas, including ski resorts, for dormitory-like housing for their many employees.

The county planning department should be acting conservatively and propose this project for Resort zoning only at this time! By proposing the RM districts for SROs, the county would be unnecessarily impacting a huge number of residents who live near or adjacent to RM districts, and would also negatively impact the property values of those residents.

The county is already struggling with the loss of property values; so it is inconceivable that that a proposal would be presented that would increase the loss of property values.

Please remove the RM zoning area in the proposal for SROs, and protect the residents of Placer County from the possible proliferation of SROs throughout residential neighborhoods.

Regarding the Farmworker Housing(FH) ZTA, I hope you are right that setback requirements and sewer/water requirements will be enforced to prevent FH units on small RA parcels. Variances on the setbacks and other restrictions should not be allowed for these FH units on RA parcels that are smaller than a certain size, such as 4.6 acres.

Please add this email to the comments on the SRO and FH ZTAs.
Thanks again Chris for answering my questions.

Muriel
8/23/12
663-4123

--- On Wed, 8/22/12, Christopher Schmidt <CRSchmid@placer.ca.gov> wrote:

From: Christopher Schmidt <CRSchmid@placer.ca.gov>
Subject: ZTA Questions
To: "chamdavis@yahoo.com" <chamdavis@yahoo.com>
Cc: "Catherine Donovan" <CDonovan@placer.ca.gov>, "Crystal Jacobsen" <CJacobse@placer.ca.gov>, "Maywan Krach" <MKrach@placer.ca.gov>

Date: Wednesday, August 22, 2012, 3:38 PM

Hi Muriel-

Crystal forwarded me your questions regarding the SRO and Farmworker Zoning Text Amendments.

The State did not say which district(s) a municipality must allow for SRO units, but it must allow them in at least one. The County picked the RM zone district because these are basically small apartments, but may lack bathroom and/or kitchen facilities. By definition, the SRO complex must contain at least five units, so it is 'multi-family.' We also selected the Resort and Highway Service zones because this is where motels are typically located. Motels are the type of property we believe are most likely to be converted to SRO units.

You are correct about "SRO Residential Hotel" being confusing. In many communities that is what they are known as. We are going to drop the "hotel" portion and are now calling these "Single Room Occupancy Residential Housing Units."

State housing law says we have to allow farmworker housing in any zones that we allow farming. We have to treat it as an allowed agricultural use. The farmworker housing may not be appropriate for small parcels and we think it will be self-regulating. Owners will need to be able to provide adequate water and sewer facilities and that may be difficult on the smaller parcels. We also don't think there will be a rush of these units or complexes but will keep an eye on things for problems and issues and can revisit some standards in the future. But by law we need to allow them on RA-zoned parcels.

Thanks for your great questions!

Chris Schmidt

Placer County Planning

530.745.3076

SINGLE-ROOM OCCUPANCY RESIDENTIAL
HOUSING – HOUSING ELEMENT
IMPLEMENTATION, ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT
(PZTA 20110258)

PLACER COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 17,
ARTICLES 17.04, 17.06, 17.20, 17.22, 17.26, 17.30,
17.34, 17.48 AND 17.56 PERTAINING TO SINGLE-
ROOM OCCUPANCY RESIDENTIAL HOUSING
DEFINITION AND USE, BUILDING AND
CONSTRUCTION CODES AMENDMENT

PLACER COUNTY CODE CHAPTER 15,
ARTICLE 15.04 PERTAINING TO EFFICIENCY
DWELLING UNITS, REVISED NEGATIVE
DECLARATION, ALL SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS

Placer County Board of Supervisors

June 4, 2013 10:30 a.m.

Correspondence Received

5/28/13

County of Placer



RURAL LINCOLN MUNICIPAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

P. O. Box 716

Lincoln, CA 95648

County Contact: Administrative Aide (530) 889-4010

RE: Zoning Text Amendment RE: Single Room Occupancy

The Rural Lincoln MAC on August 20, 2012 voted to recommend the approval of the Single Room Occupancy Zoning Text Amendment bringing it in compliance with State Housing Law.

Sincerely

Mark Fowler
Chairman, Rural Lincoln MAC

cc: Jennifer Montgomery, BOS Chair

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
5 BOS Rec'd COB CoCo
TSI _____ CEO _____ Other Plummer

SEP - 5 2012

Sup D1 _____ Sup D4 _____ Aide D1 _____ Aide D4 _____
Sup D2 _____ Sup D5 _____ Aide D2 _____ Aide D5 _____
Sup D3 _____ Aide D3 _____