
3.11 LAND USE AND PLANNING

3.11.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the existing land uses in the project vicinity that could be affected by implementation of the Proposed Action and its alternatives. It also describes the relevant land use plans, policies, and regulations governing the project area affected by the alternatives considered in this Draft EIS. The focus of this section is the evaluation of the consistency of the Proposed Action and its alternatives with applicable land use plans and policies. Impacts on agricultural and recreational land uses, as well as those related to growth inducement, are discussed in other sections of this EIS.

Sources of information used in this analysis include:

- The EIR prepared for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan by the City (City of Roseville 2010a);
- Land use policies listed in the City of Roseville 2025 General Plan (City of Roseville 2010b); and
- Regulations listed in the City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance (City of Roseville 2006).

3.11.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The Proposed Action is located in southwestern Roseville within a portion of western Placer County characterized by gently rolling topography and large, open annual grassland areas. The City of Roseville is the largest of the six incorporated cities in Placer County. Roseville's planning area includes approximately 42.2 square miles (109 square kilometers) of incorporated lands as well as an additional 4,854 acres (1,964 hectares) which make up the City's sphere of influence. The City consists of a wide range of existing land uses, including approximately 1,185 acres (480 hectares) of residential development, 2,095 acres (848 hectares) of commercial/retail uses, 840 acres (340 hectares) of office uses, and 2,559 acres (1,036 hectares) of industrial uses. In addition, there are an estimated 2,961 acres (1,198 hectares) of open space and 2,094 acres (847 hectares) of park and recreation uses (City of Roseville 2010a).

3.11.2.1 Project Site – Existing Land Uses and Designations

The Proposed Action and on-site alternatives would implement the Westbrook project, which would allow for future development of approximately 397 acres (161 hectares) of the project site with a mix of land uses.

The project site is within City limits. The Westbrook project proposes a mix of land uses within the plan area, including 2,029 single- and multi-family residential units, 43 acres (17 hectares) of commercial and office uses, 11 acres (4 hectares) of public/quasi-public uses (such as schools), 16 acres (6 hectares) of parks, 37 acres (15 hectares) of open space, and 35 acres (14 hectares) of major roadways, paseos, and landscape corridors.

The vast majority of the project site is undeveloped and used for cattle grazing. One set of power lines extend through the project site in a north-south direction along the proposed alignment of Westbrook Boulevard.

The City of Roseville 2025 General Plan currently designates the project site for Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Community Commercial, Community Commercial (Community Mixed Use), Public/Quasi-Public, Park, and Open Space. The same designations also apply to the project site under the City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance.

3.11.2.2 Existing and Planned Land Uses in the Vicinity of Project Site

Lands to the north and east of the project site are located within the West Roseville Specific Plan area. Only land to the east of the project site within the West Roseville Specific Plan area is developed at this time. Land to the south of the project site is located within the Sierra Vista Specific Plan area, and is not developed at this time.

Adjacent unincorporated areas in Placer County are located to the west of the project site. These areas currently include land under agricultural rice production and undeveloped dry pastureland. A majority of the lands to the west are associated with the Regional University and Community Specific Plan, which is a County-approved project comprising approximately 1,100 acres (445 hectares) and consisting of two components – a 600-acre (243-hectare) area designated for a private university campus and a 558-acre (226 hectare) community designated for residential and commercial uses.

Another County-approved large-scale development project in the vicinity of the project site is the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan project. This project is located south of Baseline Road on approximately 5,000 acres (2,023 hectares) and consists of approximately 14,000 residential units and 6 million square feet (0.5 million square meters) of non-residential development.

3.11.2.3 Alternative Site – Existing Land Uses and Designations

The alternative site is approximately 406 acres (164 hectares) in size and is approximately 3 miles (4.8 kilometers) to the northeast of the project site along Foothill Boulevard. The site is located in unincorporated Placer County, outside the City of Roseville’s Sphere of Influence (SOI), within the Sunset Industrial Area Plan area. The alternative site is bounded by undeveloped land to the north, industrial development to the east, residential development within the City of Roseville’s North Industrial area and the North Roseville Specific Plan area to the south, and undeveloped land to the west. Current land uses within the alternative site include undeveloped dry pastureland.

The Sunset Industrial Area Plan currently designates the alternative site for industrial uses. The alternative site is designated in the Placer County Zoning Ordinance as Industrial Park combining Design Scenic Corridor (INP-Dc), Industrial Park combining Design Scenic Corridor combining Flood Hazards (INP-Dc-FH), General Commercial combining Use Permit combining Design Scenic Corridor (C2-UP-Dc), and Farm combining building site, minimum 160 acres, combining Development Reserve (F-B-X-DR 160).

3.11.2.4 Existing and Planned Land Uses in the Vicinity of Off-Site Alternative Site

The alternative site is surrounded by unincorporated areas of Placer County to the west, north, and east, and the City of Roseville to the south. The unincorporated areas include industrial uses to the east and undeveloped dry pastureland to the north and west. Land uses in the City of Roseville include residential areas located in the North Industrial Plan area and the North Roseville Specific Plan area. The Western Regional Landfill is located approximately 1 mile (1.6 kilometers) to the northwest of the alternative site.

Lands to the north, east, and west of the alternative site are also located in the Sunset Industrial Area Plan. Lands to the north and west are planned for industrial uses while lands to the east are planned for both for both industrial and commercial use. Land to the south is built out with residential uses and no additional uses on these lands are planned at this time.

Lands along the alignments of the off-site infrastructure between Industrial Boulevard to the east and Fiddymment Road to the west consist of grazing land. Under the Sunset Industrial Area Plan lands that lie adjacent to these alignments are planned for industrial and agricultural uses. Lands along the alignment of the off-site infrastructure along Fiddymment Road and west of Fiddymment Road mainly consist of residential uses and a riparian corridor associated with Pleasant Grove Creek.

3.11.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK – APPLICABLE LAWS, REGULATIONS, PLANS, AND POLICIES

This section summarizes relevant policies contained in the City of Roseville General Plan and Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint.

3.11.3.1 City of Roseville 2025 General Plan

The City of Roseville's General Plan (2010b) Land Use Element contains the following goals and policies for growth management, including specific direction for new growth areas west of Fiddymment Road.

- Goal 1:** The City shall proactively manage and plan for growth.
- Goal 2:** The City shall encourage a pattern of development that promotes the efficient and timely provision of urban infrastructure and services, and preserve valuable natural and environmental resources.
- Goal 3:** Growth shall mitigate its impacts through consistency with the General Plan goals and policies and shall provide a positive benefit to the community.
- Goal 4:** The City shall continue a comprehensive, logical planning process, rather than an incremental, piecemeal approach.
- Goal 5:** The City shall encourage public participating in the development of a monitoring of growth management policies and programs.
- Goal 6:** The City shall manage and evaluate growth in a regional context, not in isolation.

- Goal 7:** Potential population growth in Roseville must be based on the long-term carrying capacities and limits of the roadway system, sewer and water treatment facilities, and electrical utility service, as defined in the Circulation Element and the Public Facilities Element.
- Goal 8:** Growth and development must occur at a rate corresponding to the availability of desired facilities capacity and the attainment of define General Plan levels of service for public activities.
- Goal 9:** Growth should be managed to minimize negative impacts to existing businesses and residents within the City.
- Goal 10:** Growth should be planned in a way that addresses the appropriate interface between City and County lands.
- Goal 11:** New growth should be designed to meet the Guiding Principles.
- Goal 12:** The City shall use growth management as a tool to maintain the City's identity, community form, and reputation in region, to maintain high levels of service for residents and to influence projects outside the City's boundaries that have the potential to affect the quality of life and/or services that are provided to residents.
- Goal 13:** New development to the west of Fiddymet Road shall be consistent with the City's desire to establish an edge along the western boundary of the City that fosters: a physical separation from County lands through a system of connected open space, a well-defined sense of entry to City from the west; opportunities for habitat preservation and recreation; and view preservation corridors that provide an aesthetic and recreational resource for residents.
- Policy 4:** Specific plans will be evaluated based on the following minimum criteria:
- a. Government Code requirements for specific plans;
 - b. Demonstrated consistency with General Plan goals and policies;
 - c. Demonstrated consistency with the identified City-wide studies and holding capacity analysis;
 - d. Justification for proposed specific plan boundaries;
 - e. Community benefit;
 - f. Ability to mitigate impacts;
 - g. Impact on the City's growth pattern.

Each specific plan proposal shall include, with its initial submittal, a full analysis of how the plan complies with and relates to the above factors. The specific plan's consistency with the General Plan and its relation to other identified criteria will be a primary factor in determining whether the proposal will or will not be considered by the City.

- Policy 5:** Apply the City's adopted Guiding Principles to any new development proposed in and out of the City's corporate boundaries, which is not already part of an adopted Specific Plan or within the Infill area:
1. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall, on a stand-alone basis have an overall neutral or positive fiscal impact on the City's General Fund.
 2. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall include logical growth/plan boundaries and an east to west growth pattern.
 3. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall not conflict with the Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant and future Power Generation Facility.
 4. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall maintain the integrity of existing neighborhoods and create a sense of place in new neighborhoods.
 5. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall include a plan to ensure full funding and maintenance of improvements and services at no cost to existing residents (including increased utility rates). A proposal shall not burden/increase the cost, or diminish the supply and reliability of services.
 6. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall aid in regional traffic solutions and in right of way preservation.
 7. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall secure and provide a new source and supply of surface water and should include reduced water demand through the use of recycled water and other offsets.
 8. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall consider development potential within the entire City/County Memorandum of Understanding Transition Area in the design and sizing of infrastructure improvements.
 9. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall aid in resolution of regional storm water retention.
 10. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall incorporate mechanisms to ensure new schools are available to serve residents and shall not impact existing schools.
 11. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall include a significant interconnected public open space component/conservation plan in coordination with the City of Roseville/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Memorandum of Understanding.
 12. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall include a public participation component to keep the public informed and solicit feedback throughout the specific plan process.
 13. Any development proposal west of Roseville shall provide a "public benefit" to the City and residents.

The City of Roseville's General Plan (2010b) Public Facilities Element contains the following goal with regards to cooperation between City and schools.

Goal 2: The City and the school districts enjoy a mutually beneficial arrangement in the joint-use of school and public facilities. Joint-use facilities shall be encouraged in all cases unless there are overriding considerations that make it impossible or detrimental to either the school district or the City parks and recreation facilities/programs.

3.11.3.2 Sacramento Area Council of Governments

SACOG is a regional organization that provides a variety of planning functions over its six-county region (Sacramento, Yolo, Placer, Sutter, Yuba, and El Dorado counties). SACOG's primary functions are to provide transportation planning and funding for the region and to study and support resolution of regional issues. The SACOG conducted several local community workshops to help determine how the Sacramento region should grow through the year 2050. The result of these efforts was the SACOG Blueprint, a transportation and land use analysis suggesting how cities and counties should grow based on the following set of smart growth principles:

- **Transportation Choices:** Developments should be designed to encourage people to sometimes walk, ride bicycles, ride the bus, ride light rail, take the train or carpool. Use of Blueprint growth concepts for land use and right-of-way design will encourage use of these modes of travel and the remaining auto trips will be, on average, shorter.
- **Mixed-Use Developments:** Buildings, homes, and shops; entertainment, office, and even light industrial uses near each other can create active, vital neighborhoods. This mixture of uses can be either in a vertical arrangement (mixed in one building) or horizontal (with a combination of uses in close proximity). These types of projects function as local activity centers, contributing to a sense of community, where people tend to walk or bike to destinations and interact more with each other. Separated land uses, on the other hand, lead to the need to travel more by auto because of the distance between uses.
- **Compact Development:** Creating environments that are more compactly built and use space in an efficient but aesthetic manner can encourage more walking, biking, and public-transit use and shorten auto trips.
- **Housing Choice and Diversity:** Providing a variety of places where people can live (apartments, condominiums, townhouses, and single-family detached homes on varying lot sizes) and creating opportunities for the variety of people who need them: families, singles, seniors, and people with special needs. This issue is of special concern for people with very low, low, and moderate incomes. By providing a diversity of housing options, more people would have a choice.
- **Use of Existing Assets:** In urbanized areas, development on infill or vacant lands, intensification of the use of underutilized parcels, or redevelopment can make better use of existing public infrastructure. This can also include rehabilitation and reuse of historic buildings; denser clustering of buildings in suburban office parks; and joint use of existing public facilities, such as schools and parking garages.
- **Quality Design:** The design details of any land use development, such as the relationship to the street, setbacks, placement of garages, sidewalks, landscaping, the aesthetics of building design, and the design of the public rights-of-way, are factors that can influence the attractiveness of

living in a compact development and facilitate the ease of walking and biking to work or neighborhood services. Good site and architectural design is an important factor in creating a sense of community and a sense of place.

- **Natural Resources Conservation:** This principle encourages the incorporation of public use open space (such as parks, town squares, trails, and greenbelts) within development projects, above state requirements; it also encourages wildlife and plant habitat preservation, agricultural preservation, and promotion of environmentally friendly practices, such as energy-efficient design, water conservation and stormwater management, and planting of shade trees.

In December 2004, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted the Preferred Blueprint Scenario (hereinafter SACOG Blueprint), a vision for growth that promotes compact, mixed-use development and more transit choices as an alternative to low-density development. The project site, which includes the Proposed Action and on-site alternatives, is designated in the SACOG Blueprint for single-family small lot and high-density mixed residential uses. The alternative site is designated for low-density mixed-use center or corridor and attached residential uses in the SACOG Blueprint.

In April 2012, the SACOG Board of Directors adopted the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) 2035. In 2008, Senate Bill (SB) 375 was signed into law, which created regional targets for greenhouse gas emissions reductions from cars and light trucks, and required regional planning agencies to create a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The MTP/SCS 2035 meets the federal requirement for an updated MTP every four years and meets the new state-requirements under SB 375 for the SACOG area. The MTP/SCS 2035 provides a plan to meet the required greenhouse gas emissions reductions, while accounting for regional housing needs, transportation demands, population growth, and financial constraints.

A primary purpose of SB 375 was to align regional transportation planning efforts, regional greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets, and land use and housing allocations with one another. Each SCS should include land uses consistent with regional GHG reduction targets determined by the California Air Resources Board based on statewide GHG targets mandated under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly known as AB 32 (Chapter 488, Statutes of 2006). The development of land identified for development in an SCS is therefore considered consistent with achieving AB 32 GHG targets.

Notably, in adopting its SCS in 2012, SACOG used population and market demand projections updated since 2004, when SACOG created its “Blueprint Plan,” the pre-SB 375 predecessor to the SCS. As SACOG explained:

[t]he 2035 growth forecast indicates that population in the plan area is expected to grow by 871,000 people, an increase of about 39 percent, between 2008 and 2035. ... [T]his forecast is lower than the 1.3 million people forecasted in the 2008 MTP, which had the same 2035 planning horizon, but used 2005 as the base year. As a result of the lower population forecast, the housing and employment forecast for the region is also lower than the forecast in the previous plan, resulting in the need to accommodate approximately 361,000 new employees and 303,000 new housing units between 2008 and 2035.

A decline in domestic in-migration is the principal cause of the declining population projections, although the recent recession also contributes to declining population growth in the early years. The U.S. economy is projected to grow at a slower rate, California is projected to get a smaller share of U.S. job and population growth, and the region's economy is expected to recover at a slower rate than some other areas of the state, with state budget deficits restraining job growth in the public sector over the next decade. Although the region is expected to have a smaller job growth advantage than was anticipated in the 2008 MTP, the SACOG region is still expected to outpace the state and nation in job growth in the latter part of the planning period.

3.11.4 SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

3.11.4.1 Significance Thresholds

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) does not specify significance thresholds that may be used to evaluate the effects of a proposed action related to land use and planning. However, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidance requires an evaluation of a proposed action's effect on the human environment. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has determined that the Proposed Action or its alternatives would result in significant effects related to land use and planning if the Proposed Action or an alternative would:

- result in the development of incompatible land uses;
- physically divide an established community; or
- conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations.

3.11.4.2 Analysis Methodology

The evaluation of land use compatibility was based on a qualitative comparison of existing and proposed uses on the site and their compatibility with existing and planned land uses as defined in the City's General Plan as well as other applicable local and regional environmental and planning documents.

3.11.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact LU-1 Result in Incompatible Land Uses

No Action Alt. Implementation of the No Action Alternative would not result in the development of incompatible land uses on the project site. In addition, residential land uses developed on the site would not be incompatible with existing agricultural uses on adjacent lands. This **indirect** effect is **less than significant**. Proposed mitigation would further reduce this effect. **No direct** effect would occur.

The land use plan under the No Action Alternative is shown on **Figure 2.0-6, No Action Alternative** (in **Chapter 2.0, Proposed Action and Alternatives**). As the plan shows, commercial land uses would be located along portions of Santucci Boulevard and Westbrook Boulevard, and residential land uses are proposed throughout the rest of the site. In general, land uses that are compatible are located adjacent to each other. However, some conflicts between adjacent land uses could still arise. For example, elevated noise levels and increased lighting associated with the proposed parks could negatively affect

nearby residential uses. However, adherence to the City's noise ordinance and implementation of the mitigation measure identified in **Section 3.1, Aesthetics**, would reduce the severity of potential noise and light effects of this use on adjacent land uses. Similarly, some of the proposed community commercial uses would be located adjacent to residential uses and increased traffic associated with the commercial uses could result in conflicts. However, City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines, which regulate setback distances and establish screening standards, are incorporated into the project. Therefore, potential incompatibility between proposed commercial and residential uses would be reduced.

Residential development to the east and planned and approved residential development to the north within the West Roseville Specific Plan area are similar to the No Action Alternative and, therefore, development would not result in incompatible land uses in those areas. As discussed in **Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources**, incompatibility between residential uses and adjacent agricultural uses can arise due to issues with odors associated with certain types of agricultural activities, reduced air quality, dust, and noise. However, in the case of the No Action Alternative, there would not be a substantial incompatibility between the on-site residential land uses and the adjacent agricultural land uses because the lands along the northern, western and southern boundaries of the project site are used for cattle grazing which is not an intensive agricultural use that can result in a serious conflict with on-site residential uses. Cattle grazing does not require large agricultural machinery which reduces the dust and noise conflicts. Although lands adjacent to the northwestern boundary of the project site are in rice production which is a more intensive form of agriculture, the presence of these active rice fields would not result in a serious conflict with on-site residential uses as a 120-foot roadway corridor, which includes a 50-foot landscape buffer, would provide an adequate buffer from active agricultural operations. Due to the nature of the agricultural use and the location of the residential uses compared to the agricultural use, incompatibility between adjacent agricultural and residential uses would not occur, and this **indirect** effect is considered **less than significant**. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure AG-2** (in **Section 3.2**), which requires the disclosure of neighboring potential agricultural uses, would further reduce effects related to compatibility with adjacent agricultural uses. **No direct** effect would occur.

Proposed Action, Alts. 1 through 5 The Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5 would not result in incompatible land uses. In addition, residential land uses developed on the site under Alternatives 1 through 5 would not be incompatible with existing agricultural uses on adjacent lands. This **indirect** effect is **less than significant**. Proposed mitigation would further reduce this effect. **No direct** effect would occur.

Similar to the No Action Alternative, on-site land uses would generally be compatible with each other and the surrounding uses with the implementation of the mitigation

measures for noise and visual effects and compliance with the City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines under the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5. Although potential conflicts could occur between on-site residential uses and adjacent agricultural land uses, however, as discussed under the No Action Alternative above, cattle grazing that would occur along the project site boundaries is not an intensive agricultural use that produces large amounts of dust and noise and therefore would not result in a serious conflict.

Similar to the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 3 propose residential uses along the western boundary of the project site, in proximity to ongoing rice production. As discussed above, due to the roadway corridor and landscape buffer, there would be no conflict. Open space and commercial uses are proposed along the western boundary of the project site under Alternatives 4 and 5, rather than residential uses, eliminating any potential conflicts. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, this **indirect** effect is considered **less than significant** under the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure AG-2** (in **Section 3.2**) would further reduce this effect. **No direct** effect would occur.

Off-Site Alt. Implementation of the Off-Site Alternative would not result in the development of incompatible land uses on the alternative site. No serious conflicts between the on-site residential uses and adjacent industrial and agricultural uses would occur. In addition, on-site residential uses would not conflict with the Western Regional Landfill located 1 mile (0.6 kilometers) to the northwest of the alternative site and the installation of off-site utilities would not conflict with neighboring agricultural, rural, and urban land uses. This **indirect** effect would be **less than significant**. **No direct** effect would occur.

The Off-Site Alternative would develop a project largely similar to the Proposed Action but on a site approximately 3 miles (4.8 kilometers) to the northeast. The alternative site is bordered by industrial development to the east and residential development to the south. A 100-foot buffer that includes landscape features would be provided to buffer proposed residential development in the northern portion of the alternative site from the existing industrial uses to the east. Planned open space areas would also provide a buffer between proposed residential development in the southern portion of the alternative site and existing industrial areas to the east. Proposed residential development would be compatible with existing residential uses to the south. However, on-site residential uses would be located adjacent to agricultural uses along the western boundary, thus resulting in the potential for conflicts. Conflicts may arise due to elevated noise levels, reduced air quality, dust, and odors. Proposed on-site commercial and industrial uses along the northwestern and northern boundaries of the alternative site, respectively, would not conflict with adjacent agricultural uses as there are no buffer requirements.

Potential for conflict between on-site residential uses and adjacent agricultural land uses

is evaluated in **Section 3.2**. Existing agricultural uses on the lands adjacent to the western portion of the alternative site are limited to cattle grazing, which is not so intense as to cause a serious conflict with residential uses as cattle grazing does not require large agricultural machinery which could produce large amounts of dust and noise. No crops are grown on these lands at this time and based on the quality of soils it is unlikely that intensive agricultural uses, such as cultivation of row crops that would require spraying of pesticides or herbicides, would be conducted on these lands in the future.

The County's General Plan establishes a 1-mile (0.6 kilometer) buffer around the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill to reduce potential conflicts between landfill operations and residential development. The land use plan for this alternative has been designed such that all housing planned on the alternative site would be located more than 1 mile from the regional landfill.

Finally, off-site utility improvements required to serve the alternative site would not conflict with neighboring agricultural, rural and urban land uses as construction of these improvements would be temporary and would mostly occur within existing road rights of way. Only a proposed force main west to Fiddymont Road, the proposed force main that extends from the northwest corner of the alternative site, and the proposed water main east to Industrial Boulevard would be located outside existing rights of way on land that is presently undeveloped and used for grazing. However, these facilities would not interfere with grazing activities as these improvements would be located underground.

For the reason stated above, **indirect** effects related to compatibility between on-site land uses and between on-site and off-site land uses under the Off-Site Alternative would be **less than significant**. In addition, **Mitigation Measure AG-2** is proposed, which would further reduce effects related to compatibility with adjacent agricultural uses. **No direct** effect would occur.

Impact LU-2 Physically Divide an Established Community

No Action Alt. The project site is undeveloped grazing land and no community is present on the site. Therefore, development of the No Action Alternative would not physically divide an established community. Other effects to the human environment due to air, noise, traffic, and other environmental factors are addressed elsewhere in this document. **No direct or indirect effects** to an established community would occur. Mitigation is not required.

Proposed Action, Alts. 1 through 5 The Proposed Action and Alternatives 1 through 5 would not physically divide an established community as no community is present on the site. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, **no direct or indirect effects** to an established community would

occur under the Proposed Action or Alternatives 1 through 5. Mitigation is not required.

Off-Site Alt. The Off-Site Alternative would not physically divide an established community. The Off-Site Alternative would construct a project broadly similar to the Proposed Action on the alternative site. The alternative site includes dry pastureland and roadways. The site is not developed with an established community, and is adjacent to existing industrial development to the east and residential development to the south.

Most off-site infrastructure improvements would occur within existing rights of way and/or would be placed underground and therefore would not physically divide an established community. Only a proposed force main that extends from the northwest corner of the site west to Fiddymment Road, and the proposed water main running east to Industrial Boulevard, will be located outside existing rights of way. No communities exist or are currently planned for these areas.

Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, **no direct or indirect effects** to an established community would occur under the Off-Site Alternative. Mitigation is not required.

Impact LU-3 Conflict with General Plan and Zoning Code

No Action Alt. The project site is currently designated for a variety of residential, commercial, public/quasi-public, park, and open space uses by City of Roseville 2025 General Plan and City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance. The No Action Alternative would construct a mixed-use development on the project site consisting of these uses. In addition, the densities of residential uses under the No Project Alternative (Low Density Residential – 5.0 dwelling units/acre, Medium Density Residential – 8.0 dwelling units/acre, High Density Residential – 25.0 dwelling units/acre) would be within the allowable ranges of residential densities established in the City’s General Plan (Low Density Residential – 0.5 to 6.9 dwelling units/acre, Medium Density Residential – 7.0 to 12.9 dwelling units/acre, High Density Residential – 13.0 dwelling units/acre and above). Finally, development under the No Action Alternative would comply with all development standards contained in the City’s zoning code. Therefore, this alternative would not conflict with the City of Roseville General Plan or Zoning Code. Based on the significance criteria listed above, **no direct or indirect effects** would occur with regard to conflicts with the General Plan and Zoning Code under the No Action Alternative. Mitigation is not required.

Proposed Action The Proposed Action would construct a mixed-use development on the project site. The proposed action would develop similar types of uses as the No Action Alternative, but with a larger development footprint. As the densities for residential uses under the Proposed Action would be the same as the No Project Alternative, the residential

densities under the Proposed Action would be within the allowable ranges of residential densities established in the City's General Plan. Therefore, similar to the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would not conflict with the City of Roseville General Plan or Zoning Code. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, **no direct or indirect effects** would occur with regard to conflicts with the General Plan and Zoning Code under the Proposed Action. Mitigation is not required.

**Alts. 1
through 5**

Alternatives 1 through 5 would construct a mixed-use development on the project site. These alternatives would develop similar types of uses as the No Action Alternative, but with similar or smaller development footprints. As the densities for residential uses under Alternatives 1 through 5 would be the same as the No Project Alternative, the residential densities under each of the on-site alternatives would be within the allowable ranges of residential densities established in the City's General Plan. Therefore, similar to the No Action Alternative, these alternatives would not conflict with the City of Roseville General Plan or Zoning Code. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, **no direct or indirect effect** would occur with regard to conflicts with the General Plan and Zoning Code under Alternatives 1 through 5. Mitigation is not required.

Off-Site Alt.

The alternative site is located in unincorporated Placer County and would be annexed to the City under the Off-Site Alternative. The alternative site is not located in the City's Sphere of Influence (SOI). As part of the annexation process the alternative site would be added to the SOI, the site would be pre-zoned, and general plan and zoning amendments designating the land for a variety of residential, commercial, public/quasi-public, park, and open space uses would be prepared and adopted for the alternative site. Land uses under the Off-Site Alternative would be consistent with the land use designations contained in the general plan and zoning amendments and therefore would be consistent with the direction and general intent of the City's General Plan and individual policies.

Off-Site utility improvements required to serve the alternative site would not conflict with uses permitted in the City of Roseville or Placer County general plans as ground disturbance associated with these improvements would be temporary and the improvements would be located underground. Thus, the installation of off-site utilities would not preclude the land from being developed under the plans.

Based on the significance criteria listed above, **no direct or indirect effects** would occur with regard to conflicts with the General Plan and Zoning Code under the Off-Site Alternative. No mitigation would be required.

Impact LU-4 Conflict with SACOG Blueprint and Sustainable Communities Strategy

No Action Alt. The No Action Alternative would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint or SCS. This **indirect** effect is considered **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required.

The No Action Alternative would develop a mixed-use, mixed-density community that is generally consistent with the SACOG Blueprint designations. The SACOG Blueprint map designates the project site for single-family small lot and high-density mixed residential uses.

To help foster development patterns that incorporate SACOG Blueprint Objectives, the City of Roseville adopted a set of Implementation Strategies in 2005 to guide development projects in Roseville. These implementation strategies give the City a means to implement the smart growth principles derived via the SACOG Blueprint effort in the newly developing areas.

The No Action Alternative would incorporate smart growth elements, consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Objectives and the City's Blueprint Implementation Strategies. In addition to density, other objectives include connectivity of neighborhoods, adjacencies of uses, and opportunities for alternative modes of travel. In addition, the project site is in an area identified for future growth on the SACOG Blueprint land use map. The various elements incorporated into the No Action Alternative that make it consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Objectives are outlined below:

- **Transportation Choices:** The No Action Alternative would encourage people to utilize alternative modes of travel by providing a comprehensive system of street-separated multi-use pathways. Specifically, the No Action Alternative includes approximately 8.5 miles of landscaped corridor/paseos.
- **Mixed-Use Developments:** Higher density residential uses will be placed adjacent to commercial uses in order to provide access to shopping and services without the use of a vehicle.
- **Compact Development:** The No Action Alternative land use plan provides a mix of residential land uses that emphasize creating neighborhoods with small-lot or attached single-family homes. Sixty-nine percent of the units proposed under the No Action Alternative are either high-density residential (25 per acre) or medium density residential (8 units per acre) units. Only 31 percent of the units are proposed for low density residential (LDR). These densities will support a development pattern that is more efficient by creating neighborhoods that are more compactly built, thereby reducing reliance on the automobile and encouraging walking, biking, and use of public transit.
- **Housing Choices:** The medium-and high-density residential areas will support a variety of housing types: apartments, condominiums, townhouses, and single-family detached homes on varying lot sizes, which addresses multiple demographic, pricing, and market segments.

- **Use of Existing Assets:** The project site is immediately adjacent to existing and proposed urban development and would therefore be able to utilize the existing infrastructure, minimizing the amount of roadway and utilities expansion required.
- **Quality Design:** Development under the No Action Alternative would adhere to the City of Roseville's Community Design Guidelines which would support the creation of community greens/plazas, ensure that retail centers are distinctive and attractive destinations, and ensure that higher density housing are attractive features of the neighborhood.
- **Natural Resource Conservation:** The Open Space plan under the No Action Alternative conserves and preserves natural resource areas, including prominent vernal pool concentrations and drainages, through the designation of permanent open space. The No Action Alternative includes 121.6 acres (49.2 hectares) of open space areas. As a result of designating open space areas on the project site, 12.5 acres (5.1 hectares) of wetlands would be preserved within the project site as part of the No Action Alternative. These open space areas also protect several prominent drainages and swales that pass through the project area. All open space and public uses would be designated and are sized consistent with General Plan policies and standards.

The Preferred Blueprint Scenario was used as the starting point in the development of the SCS. The SCS included land use maps identifying areas that SACOG considered appropriate for development. The Sierra Vista Specific Plan, which includes the Westbrook property, was included in these maps as a "developing community." SACOG characterized "developing communities" such as Westbrook as "typically, though not always, situated on vacant land at the edge of existing urban or suburban development; they are the next increment of urban expansion. Developing Communities are identified in local plans as special plan areas, specific plans, or master plans and may be residential-only, employment-only, or a mix of residential and employment uses." In addition, the SCS specifically mentioned the inclusion of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan in its planning projections. As the SCS designates the Westbrook property for development and includes it in its planning projection, development of the project site pursuant to the No Action Alternative would be generally consistent with the strategy although the site would not be developed with the number of housing units assumed in the planning projections.

Based on the above, the No Action Alternative would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint or the SCS. There would be **no direct** or **indirect effects**. Mitigation is not required.

**Proposed
Action**

The Proposed Action would, in the near term, develop a mixed-use, mixed-density urban community on the project site and would include all the various smart growth elements listed above under the No Action Alternative which would make it consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Objectives. Therefore, the Proposed Action would not

conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. In addition, the Proposed Action would provide more residential and non-residential uses compared to the No Action Alternative. The Proposed Action would provide 2,029 dwelling units, which represents a 35 percent increase in dwelling units when compared to the No Action Alternative. The Proposed Action would also include 43 acres (17 hectares) of commercial space, which represents a 45 percent increase in non-residential space when compared to the No Action Alternative. As a result, the Proposed Action would provide additional opportunities for meeting SACOG Blueprint Objectives due to its higher density and would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. In addition, as noted above, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, which includes the Westbrook property, was included in the SCS's planning projections and the Westbrook property was designated as a developing community in the SCS. Therefore the Proposed Action would not conflict with the SCS. There would be **no direct** or **indirect effects**. No mitigation is required.

Alt. 1

Alternative 1 – Reduced Footprint, Increased Density would, in the near term, develop a mixed-use, mixed-density urban community on the project site and would include all the various smart growth elements listed above under the No Action Alternative which would make it consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Objectives. Therefore, Alternative 1 would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. In addition, Alternative 1 would provide 1,890 dwelling units, which represents a 25 percent increase in dwelling units when compared to the No Action Alternative. Alternative 1 would also include approximately 40 acres (16 hectares) of commercial space, which represents a 34 percent increase in non-residential space when compared to the No Action Alternative. As a result, Alternative 1 would provide additional opportunities for meeting SACOG Blueprint Objectives due to its higher density. In addition, as noted above, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, which includes the Westbrook property, was included in the SCS's planning projections and the Westbrook property was designated as a developing community in the SCS. Therefore development of the project site pursuant to Alternative 1 would not conflict with the SCS. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, there would be **no direct** or **indirect effects**. No mitigation is required.

Alt. 2

Alternative 2 – Reduced Footprint, Same Density would, in the near term, develop a mixed-use, mixed-density urban community on the project site and would include all the various smart growth elements listed above under the No Action Alternative which would make it consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Objectives. Therefore, Alternative 2 would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. In addition, Alternative 2 would provide 1,405 dwelling units, which represents a 6 percent decrease in dwelling units when compared to the No Action Alternative. However, Alternative 2 would also include approximately 40 acres (16 hectares) of commercial space, which represents a 33 percent increase in non-residential space when compared to the No Action

Alternative. As a result, Alternative 2 would provide roughly the same amount of development as the No Action Alternative. In addition, as noted above, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, which includes the Westbrook property, was included in the SCS's planning projections and the Westbrook property was designated as a developing community in the SCS. Therefore development of the project site pursuant to Alternative 2 would not conflict with the SCS. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, there would be **no direct or indirect effects**. No mitigation is required.

Alt. 3

Alternative 3 – Central Preserve would, in the near term, develop a mixed-use, mixed-density urban community on the project site and would include all the various smart growth elements listed above under the No Action Alternative which would make it consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Objectives. Therefore, Alternative 3 would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. In addition, Alternative 3 would provide 1,495 dwelling units, which represents less than a 1 percent decrease in dwelling units when compared to the No Action Alternative. Alternative 3 would also include approximately 40 acres (16 hectares) of commercial space, which represents a 34 percent increase in non-residential space when compared to the No Action Alternative. As a result, the additional commercial space under Alternative 3 would provide additional opportunities for meeting SACOG Blueprint Objectives due to its higher density. In addition, as noted above, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, which includes the Westbrook property, was included in the SCS's planning projections and the Westbrook property was designated as a developing community in the SCS. Therefore development of the project site pursuant to Alternative 3 would not conflict with the SCS. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, there would be **no direct or indirect effects**. No mitigation is required.

Alts. 4 and 5

Alternatives 4 and 5 would, in the near term, develop a mixed-use, mixed-density urban community on the project site and would include all of the various smart growth elements listed above under the No Action Alternative that would make it consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Objectives. Therefore, Alternatives 4 and 5 would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. Both alternatives would provide fewer residential and non-residential uses compared to the No Action Alternative. The number of residential units provided under Alternatives 4 and 5 would be 1,340 and 1,256 residential units, respectively, which represent a 10 to 17 percent reduction in dwelling units when compared to the No Action Alternative. The amount of commercial space provided under Alternatives 4 and 5 would total of 22.8 acres and 18.7 acres, respectively, which represents a 23 to 37 percent reduction in non-residential space when compared to the No Action Alternative. However, while less development would be provided under both alternatives, densities proposed under these alternatives

would still meet SACOG density requirements for the project site. In addition, as noted above, the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, which includes the Westbrook property, was included in the SCS's planning projections and the Westbrook property was designated as a developing community in the SCS. Therefore development of the project site pursuant to Alternatives 4 and 5 would not conflict with the SCS. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the No Action Alternative, there would be **no direct** or **indirect effects**. No mitigation is required.

Off-Site Alt. The Off-Site Alternative would construct a project broadly similar to the Proposed Action on the alternative site, which is located approximately 3 miles (4.8 kilometers) northeast of the project site. The proposed mixed-use community developed at this site would be contiguous with existing urban development to the east in Placer County and to the south in Roseville. The alternative site has previously been considered for development, and is designated for low-density mixed-use center or corridor and attached residential uses on the SACOG Blueprint map. This alternative would result in similar densities of uses that are currently designated for its site. Off-Site utility improvements required to serve the alternative site would not interfere with the implementation of the SACOG Blueprint as these improvements would be located underground. The installation of off-site utilities would not preclude the land from being developed with land uses listed in the SACOG Blueprint. While the alternative site is vacant, it is considered an established community in the SCS due to its proximity to the State Route 65 corridor. As the SCS designates the alternative site for development, the Off-Site Alternative is consistent with the strategy. Based on the above, this alternative would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint or the SCS. Based on the significance criteria listed above, there would be **no direct** or **indirect effects**. No mitigation is required.

3.11.6 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

All of the **direct** and **indirect** effects would be **less than significant**.

3.11.7 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The effects discussed above are either site specific and therefore would not cumulate with other land use effects or are of the type that would not cumulate. Therefore, there would be no cumulative effects related to land use and planning under the Proposed Action and all alternatives.

3.11.8 REFERENCES

- City of Roseville. 2010a. *Sierra Vista Specific Plan Final Environmental Report*.
 City of Roseville. 2010b. *City of Roseville General Plan 2025*. Adopted May 5.