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 consistency 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);
- Regulations listed in the City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance (City of Roseville 2006); and
- Land use policies listed in the Placer County General Plan Housing Element (Placer County 1994).

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) 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 develop a large-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density master planned community on an approximately 1,612-acre (652 hectares) site located in the western portion of the City of Roseville, in western Placer County.

The project site is within City limits. The Sierra Vista Specific Plan proposes a mix of land uses within the plan area, including 6,650 single-family and multi-family residential units; approximately 216 acres (87 hectares) of commercial and office uses; approximately 91 acres (27 hectares) of parks; approximately 234 acres (95 hectares) of open space, and approximately 61 acres (25 hectares) set aside for schools and other public/quasi-public uses.

The vast majority of the project site is undeveloped and used for cattle grazing. There are two small areas along Baseline Road where strawberry fields and a fruit stand are present. Developed uses within the

project site includes four large-lot single-family residences, small structures associated with ongoing dry farming agricultural activities (grazing), and two sets of power lines that extend through the project site. The larger power line corridor, owned and operated by the Western Area Power Authority (WAPA), extends in an east-west direction through the center of the project site while a smaller corridor extends from the northern boundary of the project site to the WAPA corridor. Curry Creek traverses the southern portion of the site in a westerly direction, crossing south of Baseline Road for a distance, and ultimately crossing back north, traversing the western corner of the project site.

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 City of Roseville, and include the West Roseville Specific Plan area to the north, Del Webb Specific Plan area to the northeast, and the North Roseville Specific Plan area to the east. The North Roseville Specific Plan and the Del Webb Specific Plan areas are fully developed at the present time. The lands within the West Roseville Specific Plan area are approved for development and some of the area is currently under development. A specific plan development has been proposed for the 400-acre (162-hectare) property located adjacent to the northwest boundary of the project site.

Land designated and zoned for residential development within the existing City of Roseville boundaries is fully entitled for future development, and according to development projections is anticipated to be built out by 2020 (City of Roseville 2010a).

Adjacent unincorporated areas in Placer County are located to the west and south of the project site. These areas currently include undeveloped dry pastureland and rural residential uses, generally similar to the conditions on the project site.

The County has recently approved several large development projects in the vicinity. These include the Placer Vineyards and Regional University and Community Specific Plan projects. The land to the south of Baseline Road is part of the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area, which is a County-approved mixed-use project on approximately 5,000 acres (2,023 hectares) with approximately 14,000 residential units and 6 million square feet (0.5 million square meters) of non-residential development. The Regional University and Community Specific Plan project is an approximately 1,100-acre (445-hectare) site, located northwest of the project site. It includes a 600-acre (243-hectare) area designated for a private university campus, and other areas designated for residential and commercial uses.

The area generally to the west of the Proposed Action is referred to as the Curry Creek Community Area, although Placer County has not yet initiated a planning process to develop a Community Plan for that area. The area has primarily been used for grazing or other dry farming activity in the past and remains rural.

3.11.2.3 Alternative 4 Site – Existing Land Uses and Designations

Alternative 4 site (Southwest site) consists of an approximately 2,397-acre (970 hectare) site located approximately 2 miles (3.2 kilometers) to the west of the project site on Baseline Road. The Southwest site is bounded by the extension of Sankey Road and the County-approved Regional University and

Community Specific Plan area to the north, the Curry Creek Community Plan area to the east, the Country Acres rural residential area and Baseline Road to the south, and the Sutter County line to the west. Current land uses within the alternative site include cultivated agricultural uses (mainly rice fields), equestrian uses, undeveloped dry pastureland, approximately 15 rural residences, and two water skiing lakes.

The Placer County General Plan currently designates the alternative site for Agriculture/Timberland uses, with 80-acre minimum parcel sizes. The alternative site is designated in the Placer County Zoning Ordinance as Farm Combining Building Site, minimum 80-acre (FB-X-80). In addition, the alternative site may eventually be subject to the Placer County Conservation Plan, although the site is not designated for preservation.

3.11.2.4 Existing and Planned Land Uses in the Vicinity of Alternative 4 Site

The alternative site is surrounded by unincorporated areas of Placer County to the north, east and south, and Sutter County to the west. These areas currently include undeveloped dry pastureland, cultivated lands (mainly rice fields), and rural residential uses. The land to the south of Baseline Road is part of the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan area, which, as noted above, is a County-approved mixed-use project with approximately 14,000 residential units and 6 million square feet (0.5 million square meters) of non-residential development. To the north of the Southwest site is the County-approved Regional University and Community Specific Plan area. Although there are no proposals for the development of the lands immediately west of Alternate 4 site, about 0.5 mile (0.8 kilometer) west of the Placer-Sutter County line, Sutter County has approved the Sutter Pointe Specific Plan which involves the development of an approximately 7,500-acre (3,035-hectare) site with 17,500 housing units, approximately 49.7 million square feet (4.6 million square meters) of commercial/industrial uses, and community facilities (Sutter County 2009).

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

This subsection summarizes relevant policies contained in both the City and the County general plans that have been developed by the local municipalities to guide urban development.

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 Fiddyment 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 Fiddyment 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 Citywide 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/US 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 Placer County General Plan

Relevant policies in the Placer County General Plan (1994) are listed below:

1.H.5 The County shall require development within or adjacent to designated agricultural areas to incorporate design, construction, and maintenance techniques that protect agriculture and minimize conflicts with adjacent agricultural uses.

I.H.G The County shall require new nonagricultural development immediately adjacent to agricultural lands to be designed to provide a buffer in the form of a setback or sufficient distance to avoid land use conflicts between the agricultural uses and the nonagricultural uses. Such setback or buffer areas shall be established by recorded easement or other instrument, subject to the approval of County Counsel. A method or mechanism (e.g., a homeowners association, or easement dedication to a nonprofit organization or public entity) for guaranteeing the maintenance of this land in a safe and orderly manner shall also be established at the time of development approval.

3.11.3.3 Sacramento Area Council of Governments

The 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—creates 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 medium- and high-density mixed residential uses and low- and medium-density mixed-use commercial centers. The Alternative 4 site is designated for agricultural uses in the SACOG Blueprint.

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 US 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, the County'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

Proposed Action

Implementation of the Proposed Action would not result in the development of incompatible land uses on the project site, and land uses developed on the site would not be incompatible with existing land uses on adjacent lands. The effect would be **less than significant**. Mitigation is proposed that would further reduce this effect.

The land use plan under the Proposed Action is shown on **Figure 2.0-2, Proposed Land Use Plan (**in **Chapter 2.0, Proposed Action and Alternatives)**. As the plan shows, commercial land uses are concentrated along Baseline Road and other major roadways, 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, the proposed Citywide park located in the southwest corner of the project site could negatively affect nearby residential uses. However, adherence to the City's noise ordinance and implementation of mitigation measures 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 use would be located adjacent to residential uses which could result in conflicts. However, City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines, which would regulate setback distances and screening standards, would ensure compatibility between proposed commercial and residential uses.

Urban development of the project site would be compatible with the existing and planned land uses abutting the site on all sides except the northwestern boundary. Lands to the northeast and east are developed with similar residential communities and there would be no conflict. Although agricultural lands that are grazed are present along portions of the southern boundary of the project site, they are separated from the project site by Baseline Road and the designated land uses on the project site along Baseline Road are commercial and open space, uses that would not be affected by adjacent agricultural operations. Potential incompatibility between on-site residential uses and adjacent agricultural uses is limited to the northwestern portion of the project site. That issue is addressed in **Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources**. As that analysis shows cattle grazing is not an intensive agricultural use that can result in a serious conflict with on-

site residential uses. This effect is considered **less than significant**. In addition, implementation of **Mitigation Measure AG-2** (in **Section 3.2**), which requires appropriate setbacks between residential and agricultural uses, would further reduce effects from incompatibility with adjacent agricultural uses.

No Action Alt. Under the No Action Alternative, with the implementation of the mitigation measures for noise and visual effects and compliance with the City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines, on-site land uses would generally be compatible with each other and the surrounding uses. The No Action Alternative would also be potentially incompatible with agricultural uses along the northwestern boundary. However, as noted above, cattle grazing that would occur along this boundary is not an intensive agricultural use that would result in a serious conflict. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, this effect is considered **less than significant** under the No Action Alternative. In addition, implementation of **Mitigation Measure AG-2** (in **Section 3.2**) would further reduce this effect.

Alts. 1, 2, 3 (On Site) Under the on-site alternatives, with the implementation of the mitigation measures for noise and visual effects and compliance with the City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines, on-site land uses would generally be compatible with each other and the surrounding uses. These alternatives would also be potentially incompatible with agricultural uses along the northwestern boundary. However, as noted above, cattle grazing that would occur along this boundary is not an intensive agricultural use that would result in a serious conflict. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, this effect is considered **less than significant** under all of the on-site alternatives. In addition, implementation of **Mitigation Measure AG-2** (in **Section 3.2**) would further reduce this effect.

Alt. 4 (Off Site) The off-site alternative would develop a project largely similar to the Proposed Action but on a site approximately 2 miles (3.2 kilometers) to the west. The Alternative 4 site is surrounded on all sides by agricultural lands. Potential for conflict between on-site uses and adjacent agricultural land uses is evaluated in **Section 3.2**. As that analysis shows, development along the site's eastern boundary would place some residential uses adjacent to grazing lands but an open space buffer or a roadway would separate the residential uses from off-site agricultural operations. Residential land uses in the northwestern portion of the site would be located adjacent to lands that are used as rice fields. However, a roadway is proposed along the site's northern boundary that would buffer the on-site uses from adjacent agricultural uses. However, neither the open space buffer nor the roadways would adequately separate residential uses from nearby intensive agricultural operations because according to Placer County, the buffer should be at least 800 feet (244 meters) in width. Therefore, there would be potential for a serious conflict between the on-site residential uses and the agricultural operations on the adjacent rice lands and the exposure of residents to agricultural nuisances would be

considered a **significant** effect based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action.

Mitigation Measure AG-2 (in **Section 3.2)** is proposed to address this effect and would reduce the effect to **less than significant**. The USACE acknowledges that it has no authority to require **Mitigation Measure AG-2** and cannot guarantee that the County will impose this measure.

Off-site improvements along utility corridors and roadways 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 rights of way. Portions of water, recycled water and sewer mains to the north of the site would be located outside existing rights of way on land that is presently under agricultural production. However, these facilities would be located along the edge of the fields and would not interfere with agricultural production. In addition, most utility improvements would be located underground after construction. As a result, no land use incompatibilities are expected from off-site utility and roadway improvements. Impacts associated with off-site infrastructure associated with Alternative 4 are expected to be **less than significant.**

Impact LU-2 Physically Divide an Established Community

Proposed Action As described above, open rangeland is located to the west and south of the project area. Urbanized land associated with the West Roseville Specific Plan is located to the north while urbanized land associated with the North Roseville Specific Plan is located to the east. Since the site is located on the periphery of existing development and is currently undeveloped grazing land with only four rural residences, the Proposed Action 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 effect** to an established community would occur. Mitigation is not required.

No Action Alt. The No Action Alternative would not physically divide an established community as it would be developed on the same site as the Proposed Action. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, **no effect** to an established community would occur under the No Action Alternative. Mitigation is not required.

Alts. 1, 2, 3 (On Site) The on-site alternatives would not physically divide an established community. All of the on-site alternatives would construct a mixed-use development on the project site and would be located on the same site as the Proposed Action. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, **no effect** to an established community would occur under any of the on-site alternatives.

Mitigation is not required.

Alt. 4 (Off Site) Alternative 4 would not physically divide an established community. Alternative 4 would construct a project broadly similar to the Proposed Action on the alternative site. The Alternative 4 site includes agricultural cultivation uses, dry pastureland, equestrian uses, and approximately 15 rural residences. The site is not developed with an established community. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, **no effect** to an established community would occur under the off-site alternative. Concerning off-site infrastructure associated with this alternative, most improvements would occur within existing rights of way and would be placed underground and therefore would not physically divide an established community. Portions of water, recycled water and sewer mains to the north of the site would be located outside existing rights of way on land that is presently under agricultural production. However, these facilities would be located along the edge of the fields and would not divide an existing community. Alternative 4 would not physically divide an established community, resulting in a **less than significant** effect. Mitigation is not required.

Impact LU-3 Conflict with General Plan and Zoning Code

Proposed Action The City of Roseville conducted a detailed review of the Proposed Action relative to General Plan policies to determine whether the Proposed Action could be inconsistent with the direction and general intent of the General Plan and individual policies. The City noted that there are a number of underlying principles that form the foundation for the goals and policies of the General Plan elements. The City found the Proposed Action to be consistent with each of the principles and therefore, consistent with each of the individual, applicable policies. The City also concluded that the Proposed Action would not conflict with the City's Zoning Code. The complete consistency analysis is presented in Chapter 7 of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (SVSP) EIR, which is incorporated by reference. **No effect** would occur. No mitigation is required.

No Action Alt. The proposed uses under the No Action Alternative would not conflict with the City of Roseville General Plan or Zoning Code. The No Action Alternative would develop the project site with urban uses similar to those of the Proposed Action and preserve additional open space in order to avoid jurisdictional waters. Therefore, similar to the Proposed Action, the proposed uses under the No Action Alternative 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 Proposed Action, **no effect** would occur with regard to conflicts with the General Plan and zoning code under the No Action Alternative. Mitigation is not required.

Alt. 1 (On Site) Alternative 1 would construct a mixed-use, mixed-density project with a reduced development footprint and increased density such that it would accommodate a similar number of residential units as the Proposed Action. This alternative would result in higher land use densities than those designated for the project site on the City of Roseville General Plan 2025 Land Use Map, and therefore would conflict with the General Plan. This represents a **significant** effect. There are no feasible mitigation measures to make this alternative consistent with the General Plan.

Alts. 2 and 3 (On Site) Alternatives 2 and 3 would construct a mixed-use development on the project site. These on-site alternatives would develop similar types of uses at the same density as the Proposed Action, but with smaller development footprints. Therefore, similar to the Proposed Action, 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 Proposed Action, **no effect** would occur with regard to conflicts with the General Plan and zoning code under Alternatives 2 and 3. Mitigation is not required.

Alt. 4 (Off Site) Alternative 4 would construct a project broadly similar to the Proposed Action on the alternative site, which is not located within the City of Roseville. Therefore, this alternative would not conflict with the City of Roseville General Plan or Zoning Code. This site is located in an unincorporated area of Placer County and is subject to the Placer County General Plan and Zoning Code. The County General Plan currently designates the site for Agricultural/Timberland uses on minimum 80-acre (32-hectare) parcels. As the area is not included in the General Plan for urban development, the development of a mixed-use, mixed-density community at this site would conflict with the County General Plan.

Placer County has planned to accommodate future growth within unincorporated areas of the County through the development of several communities: the Placer Ranch Specific Plan, which would be located northeast of the West Roseville Specific Plan, the Curry Creek Community Plan, which would be located north of Baseline Road between South Brewer Road and Watt Avenue, and the Placer Vineyards Specific Plan, which would be located south of Baseline Road. The Alternative 4 site has not previously been considered for development. Development in this area would conflict with the existing development plans of the County. This represents a **significant** effect of the off-site alternative. No mitigation is feasible.

Concerning on- and off-site infrastructure, General Plan Policy 4.A.2 requires that the County ensure through the development review process that adequate public facilities and services are available to serve new development. Alternative 4 would include a financing plan that describes how backbone infrastructure and public facilities needed to serve new development on the alternative site would be funded. The financing plan describes the costs and financing mechanisms that will be used to create these backbone

and public facility improvements, including arterial roadways; major sewer, water, storm drainage, and recycled water trunk systems. As a result, added public facilities and services would be provided as required by the General Plan. No conflict with General Plan policies governing the provision of infrastructure would occur. This represents a **less than significant** effect of the off-site alternative.

Impact LU-4 Conflict with SACOG Blueprint

Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. This effect is considered **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required.

The Proposed Action would develop a mixed-use, mixed-density community consistent with the SACOG Blueprint designations. The SACOG Blueprint map designates the project site for medium- and high-density mixed residential uses and low- and medium-density mixed-use commercial centers.

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.

To this end, the Proposed Action incorporates 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. The Proposed Action meets these objectives with the following features: specifically, the plan provides for the creation of higher-density neighborhoods with a mix of uses in Village Nodes, fosters transportation choices with provisions for bikeways and commercial corridors that will support transit, and promotes more compact development that will offer a variety of housing choices for multiple market segments. 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 Proposed Action that make it consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Objectives are outlined below:

- Transportation Choices: A variety of transportation modes are planned in the Proposed Action that will reduce reliance on automobiles. Specifically, two lanes have been reserved for a future potential Bus Rapid Transit corridor on Watt Avenue, giving the Proposed Action direct regional access to downtown Sacramento's employment centers and other destinations. Park and ride lots are also located throughout the project site to encourage carpooling. Collectively, these elements provide alternatives to the automobile by providing opportunities for public transit and carpooling. A comprehensive system of street-separated multi-use pathways is planned within the paseos, open space corridors, and landscape corridors. The Proposed Action includes approximately 9 miles

(14 kilometers) of pathways in the paseos, approximately 8 miles (13 kilometers) of pathways in the open space corridors and approximately 13 miles (21 kilometers) of pathways in landscape corridors providing many off-street connections between residential neighborhoods and open space areas, schools, parks, and commercial centers. Collectively, these elements increase transportation choices, provide alternatives to the automobile, and create land use patterns that encourage people to walk and ride bicycles (City of Roseville 2010a).

- Mixed-Use Developments: The Village Node is intended to place higher density residential uses adjacent to commercial in order to provide access to shopping and services without the use of a vehicle. This establishes places where mixed-use development can occur in an effort to provide a variety of goods and services in proximity to residential uses, which also supports alternative transportation modes such as walking and bicycling (City of Roseville 2010a).
- Compact Development: The SVSP land use plan provides a mix of residential land uses that emphasize creating neighborhoods with small-lot or attached single-family homes. Seventy-five percent of the units within the Proposed Action are either high-density residential (18-30 units per acre) or medium density residential (9 units per acre) units. Only 25 percent of the units are proposed for low density residential (LDR), and the LDR that is proposed would allow smaller lots than the development standards currently permit. 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 (City of Roseville 2010a).
- 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. In addition, in LDR areas, carriage units are allowed as an incentive to create alley-loaded residential housing types. A second unit would be allowed above garages on qualifying lots. The development standards incorporated into the SVSP, in addition to the City's Zoning Ordinance, would allow these types of housing to be developed and, collectively, this range of housing would provide residents with a mix of housing choices (City of Roseville 2010a).
- 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: Site and architectural design standards that govern the physical development of the project area are listed in the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action proposes the RS/DS zoning designation, which would allow for flexibility and deviation from zoning standards included in the primary use medium-density residential districts. This would allow LDR and medium-density residential (MDR) units to be built on smaller lots, thus resulting in more

compact development (City of Roseville 2010a). The concept of compact development is encouraged by the SACOG Blueprint.

- Natural Resource Conservation: The Proposed Action's Open Space plan conserves and preserves natural resource areas, including prominent vernal pool concentrations and drainages, through the designation of permanent open space. The Proposed Action includes 234 acres (95 hectares) of open space areas. As a result of designating open space areas on the project site, 13.71 acres (5.55 hectares) of wetlands would be preserved within the project site as part of the Proposed Action. These open space areas also protect several prominent drainages and swales that pass through the project area. All open space and public uses have been designated and are sized consistent with General Plan policies and standards (City of Roseville 2010a).

Based on the above, the Proposed Action would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. This effect is considered **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required.

No Action Alt.

The No Action Alternative would also develop a mixed-use, mixed-density community on the project site and in that respect would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint as it would develop a site designated for urban development. However, it would provide 3,729 residential units and 147 acres (59 hectares) of commercial space, which represent a 24 percent reduction in the number of dwelling units and 44 percent reduction in commercial acreage when compared to the Proposed Action. The relatively small and widely dispersed patches of open space would separate the developed areas into "islands" with inefficient roadway and utility connections. Therefore, this alternative would conflict with the SACOG Blueprint due to its lower provision of housing units and its non-contiguous pattern of development. Based on the significance criteria listed above this represents a **significant** effect. There are no feasible mitigation measures to make this alternative fully consistent with the SACOG Blueprint.

Alt. 1 (On Site)

Alternative 1 would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. This effect is considered **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required.

Alternative 1 would construct a project with a reduced development footprint and increased density such that it would accommodate a similar number of residential units as the Proposed Action. This alternative would provide additional opportunities for meeting SACOG Blueprint Objectives due to its higher density, and by building on a site designated for urban uses, similar to the Proposed Action this alternative would be consistent with the SACOG Blueprint. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, this effect is considered **less than significant** under Alternative 1. Mitigation is not required.

Alts. 2 and 3 (On Site) Alternative 2 and 3 would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. This effect is considered **less than significant**. Mitigation is not required.

These on-site alternatives would construct a mixed-use development on the project site. Both alternatives would develop similar types of land uses at the same density as the Proposed Action, but with smaller development footprints. Therefore, these alternatives would not fulfill the SACOG Blueprint Objectives as effectively because they would not provide as many dwelling units or acreage for commercial development as the Proposed Action. Overall, they would still be consistent with the SACOG Blueprint as they would develop housing and other uses on a site that is designated for urban development under the SACOG Blueprint. Based on the significance criteria listed above and for the same reasons presented above for the Proposed Action, this effect is considered **less than significant** under Alternative 2 and 3. Mitigation is not required.

Alt. 4 (Off Site) Alternative 4 would construct a project broadly similar to the Proposed Action on the alternative site, which is located approximately 2 miles west (3.2 kilometers) of the project site. At this site, the proposed mixed-use community would not be contiguous with existing urban development in Roseville that currently terminates at Fiddyment Road, approximately 4 miles (6.4 kilometers) from this site. The alternative site has not previously been considered for development, and therefore is designated for agriculture under the SACOG Blueprint. This alternative would result in higher densities of uses than are currently designated for its site and would be located in a relatively isolated area not immediately adjacent to existing urban uses, requiring the expansion of roadway and utility infrastructure over a greater distance. Therefore, this alternative would conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. Based on the significance criteria listed above, this represents a **significant** effect. There are no feasible mitigation measures to make this alternative fully consistent with the SACOG Blueprint.

3.11.6 RESIDUAL SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

Impacts related to the inconsistencies of Alternative 1 with the City of Roseville General Plan, the Off-Site Alternative with the Placer County General Plan, and the No Action and the Off-Site Alternative with the SACOG Blueprint would remain **significant**. All of the other effects would be **less than significant**.

3.11.7 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, 2010.

County of Placer. 1999. *Placer County Code*.

County of Placer. 1994. *Placer County General Plan*.

Sutter County. 2009. *Sutter Pointe Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, SCH #2007032157.