

3.12 LAND USE AND PLANNING

3.12.1 INTRODUCTION

This section describes the existing land uses in the project vicinity that could be affected by implementation of the Proposed Action and the 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 the alternatives, with applicable land use plans and policies. Specific impacts on agricultural and recreational land uses, as well as those related to growth inducement, are discussed in other sections of this Draft EIS. This section also evaluates the potential impacts on land use from the implementation of the Applicant's proposed compensatory wetlands mitigation plan that includes wetland restoration activities on three off-site mitigation properties.

Sources of information used in this analysis include:

- Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (ARSP) EIR approved by the City of Roseville June 2016 (City of Roseville 2016a);
- City of Roseville General Plan 2035 (City of Roseville 2016b); and
- Regulations listed in the City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance (City of Roseville 2006).

3.12.2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The project site is located in northwestern Roseville in an area 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 44.2 square miles of incorporated lands, as well as an additional 796 acres, which make up the City's sphere of influence (SOI). The City consists of a wide range of existing land uses, including approximately 12,846 acres of residential development, 2,284 acres of commercial/retail uses, 792 acres of office uses, and 2,369 acres of industrial uses. In addition, there are an estimated 3,151 acres of open space and 2,136 acres of park and recreation uses (City of Roseville 2016b).

3.12.2.1 Project Site – Existing Land Uses and Designations

The vast majority of the project site is undeveloped and used for cattle grazing. In June 2016, the City of Roseville adopted the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan. At the time of adoption, the City of Roseville updated the City's General Plan to designate the project site for residential and non-residential uses. The City of Roseville's 2035 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, Open Space, and Urban Reserve. The same designations also apply to the project site under the City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance.

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

Adjacent land to the north, east, and west of the northern part of the project site is located in unincorporated Placer County. To the north, adjacent to the northwestern border of the project site, is the existing Toad Hill Ranches residential subdivision, a rural subdivision of two- to five-acre parcels, while agricultural lands are located to the north adjacent to the northwestern border of the project site. To the west of the northern portion of the project site is the Gleason property, which is currently used for cattle grazing. To the east of the northern portion of the project site is the site of the proposed Placer Ranch Specific Plan (PRSP), which is also currently used for cattle grazing and is located in the County's Sunset Area Plan (SAP). Placer County is currently processing the Placer Ranch Specific Plan. The Placer Ranch Specific Plan area is a part of an update to the SAP plan. If a land use plan for Placer Ranch gets approved in the future, the PRSP area would be developed with residential, commercial and light industrial uses, and potentially a university campus (City of Roseville 2016a).

Lands to the south, southwest, and west of the southern portion of the project site are located within the City of Roseville. To the southwest is the Al Johnson Wildlife Area, a planned major regional storm water retention facility and future open space recreation area. To the south and southwest are the Creekview Specific Plan (CSP) and West Roseville Specific Plan (WRSP) areas, respectively. The CSP includes approximately 500 acres of land and would include over 2,000 residential units, commercial development, parks and open spaces, and a school at buildout; while the WRSP covers approximately 4,000 acres and includes the development of about 8,600 residential units, commercial and industrial development, parks and open space, and schools. Initial construction of the CSP has yet to commence; while the majority of the WRSP has been constructed, and final phases are currently under construction (City of Roseville 2016a). Lands not currently developed within these areas are used for grazing.

Other major land uses in the vicinity of the project site include the Western Regional Sanitary Landfill (WRSL), located 1.8 miles away from the northeastern corner of the project site, and the Roseville Energy Park (REP) and Pleasant Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant (PGWWTP), located south of the CSP area, approximately 1.1 to 1.3 miles away from the project site, respectively.

3.12.3 SIGNIFICANCE THRESHOLDS AND ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY

3.12.3.1 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 Corps has determined that the Proposed Action, or an alternative, would result in significant effects related to land use and planning if it would:

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

3.12.3.2 Analysis Methodology

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

3.12.4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impact LU-1 Result in Development of Incompatible Land Uses

No Action Alt. *Internal Land Uses*

Under the No Action alternative, commercial land uses would be located along portions of Westbrook Boulevard and residential land uses are proposed in the central portion of the project site between Westbrook Boulevard and the future alignment of Placer Parkway. 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 elementary school and parks 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 impacts due to light on adjacent land uses. Similarly, some of the proposed community commercial uses would be located adjacent to residential uses; thus, increased traffic associated with the commercial land use could result in conflicts. However, the City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines, which regulate setback distances and establish screening standards, are highly likely to be imposed by the City on the development under the No Action alternative which would minimize and/or avoid these effects. In addition, implementation of a mitigation measure identified in **Section 3.13, Noise**, would require that any commercial development demonstrate that it meets City noise standards. Finally, traffic noise and air emissions associated with the planned Placer Parkway could conflict with proposed residential land uses that are planned adjacent to the transportation right-of-way. However, noise barriers would be designed and constructed within the Parkway right-of-way, and adjacent to residential uses, which would reduce noise levels to the point where they would comply with City noise standards applicable to residential land uses. In addition, the planned Parkway is projected to only carry 18,600 average daily trips west of Westbrook Boulevard, and 33,500 average daily trips east of Westbrook Boulevard, under 2035 Cumulative Plus Project conditions. Thus, sensitive receptors would not be located within 500 feet of a freeway carrying more than 100,000 daily trips, which is the limit

recommended by the California Air Resources Board. As a result, sensitive receptors would not be exposed to a substantial health risk due to air emissions from traffic volumes on the planned Parkway. Therefore, no **direct** or **indirect** effects as a result of land use conflicts within the site under the No Action alternative were identified.

Adjacent Existing and Planned Residential Uses

Existing residential development to the northwest, planned and approved residential development to the south and southeast within the CSP and WRSP areas, respectively, and possible future residential development to the east in the PRSP area would be similar to residential development proposed under the No Action alternative. Thus, the proposed development under the No Action alternative would not result in incompatible land uses in those areas.

Adjacent Agricultural Uses

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 proposed residential land uses and the adjacent agricultural land uses due to the proposed residential development set-back buffers and the type of agricultural activity (livestock grazing) currently occurring on adjacent properties.

Agricultural activities that border the northeast border of the project site would be separated from the project site by Sunset Boulevard West, which has an approximately 90-foot right-of-way. Furthermore, there are no residential units planned for the portion of the project site along Sunset Boulevard West under the No Action alternative. Agricultural land to the east, within the PRSP area, is expected to be developed with uses consistent with that of the No Action alternative; however, until such time, a masonry wall would be constructed to separate the two properties. With respect to the vacant undeveloped land to the south and southwest of the project site, those parcels are part of the CSP and WRSP respectively, and would remain as open space, similar to the open space land proposed in the southern portion of the project site. Furthermore, there are no planned agricultural land uses within the CSP and WRSP areas. Finally, land west of the project site consists of the Gleason Ranch and the Al Johnson Wildlife Area. Cattle grazing currently occurs on the Gleason Ranch property and is expected to continue in the foreseeable future. Under the No Action alternative, no residential development would be located along the project site's western boundary with Gleason Ranch; thus, there would be no potential for conflict with adjacent agricultural uses. Due to the nature of surrounding agricultural uses and the proposed location of residential uses under the No Action alternative, **no direct** or **indirect** effects as a result of adjacent agricultural use were identified.

Adjacent Industrial and Municipal Uses

Industrial and municipal uses in the vicinity of the project site include the REP and the PGWWTP to the south, and the WRSL to the northeast. Operation of these facilities generates noise and potential odors that may be perceived by sensitive receptors within the project site. However, these industrial sources would be too distant to affect noise levels at the project site. As discussed in **Section 3.13, Noise**, ambient noise levels within the project site would be in compliance with the City's General Plan standards for sensitive receptors. With regard to exposure to odors, the Placer County Air Pollution Control District (PCAPCD) recommends a buffer of two miles between residential land use and sanitary landfills and WWTPs. The project site is less than 2 miles from WRSL and PGWWTP, the buffer distance recommended by the PCAPCD; therefore, it is possible that the No Action alternative could expose sensitive receptors to objectionable odors. This represents a **significant indirect** effect, as no feasible mitigation was identified to reduce this effect. **No direct** effects to sensitive receptors, as a result of industrial and municipal land uses, under the No Action alternative were identified.

As no wetland mitigation would be necessary under the No Action alternative, **no direct** or **indirect** effects related to incompatible land uses were identified.

**Proposed
Action, Alts. 1,
2, 3**

Similar to the No Action alternative, internal land uses would generally be compatible with each other under the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1, 2 and 3. As discussed above, under the Proposed Action and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, conflicts with surrounding land uses would be reduced and/or avoided with implementation of the mitigation measures for noise and visual effects, including compliance with the City of Roseville Community Design Guidelines. Although potential conflicts could occur between proposed residential uses and adjacent agricultural land uses, as discussed in **Section 3.2, Agricultural Resources**, the agricultural uses that would occur along the northeastern border would be sufficiently separated from residential uses on the project site by Sunset Boulevard West. Furthermore, livestock grazing occurring along the western and eastern boundaries of the project site is not an intensive agricultural use that produces large amounts of dust and noise. However, due to the proximity of the project site to WRSL and the PGWWTP, it is possible that the Proposed Action, including Alternatives 1, 2, or 3, could expose sensitive receptors to objectionable odors similar to the No Action alternative.

Based on the significance criteria listed above; and as discussed under the No Action alternative, **indirect** effects to sensitive receptors as a result of proximity to industrial and municipal land uses would be **significant** under the Proposed Action, as well as Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. No feasible mitigation was identified to reduce this effect. Therefore, the Corps finds that a **significant indirect** effect to sensitive receptors, as a result of industrial and municipal land uses, would occur. Furthermore, **no direct** effects to sensitive receptors as a result of industrial and municipal land uses were identified

under the Proposed Action, including Alternatives 1, 2, and 3.

Due to the nature of the wetlands restoration activities and the fact that there would be no change in land use at the mitigation sites, **no direct** or **indirect** impacts related to the incompatible land uses were identified.

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 under the No Action alternative were identified.

As no wetland mitigation would be necessary under the No Action alternative, **no direct** or **indirect** effects related to dividing an established community were identified.

Proposed Action, Alts. 1, 2, 3 The Proposed Action, as well as Alternatives 1, 2 and 3, would not physically divide an established community, as no community is present on the site. Based on the significance criteria listed above; and as discussed under the No Action alternative, **no direct** or **indirect** effects to an established community under the Proposed Action, or Alternatives 1, 2, or 3, were identified.

As the wetlands mitigation would not involve any construction that could affect an established community, **no direct** or **indirect** effects related to dividing an established community were identified.

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 2035 General Plan and City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance. The No Action alternative would construct a medium-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density urban community on the project site consisting of these uses. In addition, the densities of residential uses under the No Action alternative (Low Density Residential – 5.0 dwelling units/acre, Medium Density Residential – 11.0 dwelling units/acre, High Density Residential – 23.0 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). Additionally, development under the No Action alternative would comply with all development standards contained in the City’s zoning code; and thus, would not conflict

with the City of Roseville General Plan or Zoning Code. Therefore, **no direct** or **indirect** effects with regard to conflicts with the General Plan and Zoning Code under the No Action alternative were identified.

As no wetland mitigation would be necessary under the No Action alternative, **no direct** or **indirect** effects related to conflicts with General Plan and Zoning were identified.

Proposed

Action, Alts. 1, 2, 3

The Proposed Action, including Alternatives 1, 2 and 3, would construct large-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density urban communities on the project site; similar to the No Action alternative, but with a larger development footprints. Despite their larger development footprints, densities for residential uses would be the same under the Proposed Project, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, as the No Action alternative. Furthermore, residential densities under the Proposed Action, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3, 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, and Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would not conflict with the City of Roseville General Plan or Zoning Code. Therefore, **no direct** or **indirect** effects with regard to conflicts with the General Plan and Zoning Code under the Proposed Action or Alternatives 1, 2, or 3 were identified.

The construction of seasonal wetlands and/or wildlife habitat would not involve a change in land use at the mitigation sites, and while the lands would be placed under conservation easements, the lands would continue to be grazed. **No direct** or **indirect** effects related to conflicts with the General Plan and Zoning Code were identified.

Impact LU-4

Conflict with SACOG Blueprint and Sustainable Communities Strategy

No Action Alt.

The No Action alternative would develop a moderate-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density urban community that is generally consistent with the SACOG Blueprint designations. The SACOG Blueprint map designates the eastern half of the project site as an appropriate area to accommodate urban growth

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 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. Various elements

incorporated into the No Action alternative, which make it consistent with SACOG's Blueprint objectives, are outlined below:

- **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. Approximately half (54 percent) of the units proposed under the No Action alternative are either high-density residential (13 or more units per acre) or medium density residential (7 to 12.9 units per acre), while the remaining units (46 percent) are proposed for low density residential (LDR). In addition to the proposed densities, proposed commercial development would support a more efficient development pattern by creating neighborhoods that are more compactly built; thereby, reducing reliance on the automobile and encouraging walking, biking, and/or the use of public transit.
- **Quality Design:** Development under the No Action alternative would incorporate design features that make it pedestrian friendly and facilitate the ease of walking and biking to neighborhood services. These features include, but are not limited to; a modified grid street network that creates shorter, more traditional feeling block lengths; a linked network of linear parks, paseos and sidewalks; narrow tree lined streets; architectural diversity; alley loaded garage placement; and, where front loaded garages are allowed, requiring the placement of the garage to be behind the living space.
- **Housing Choices:** Residential development under the No Action alternative would support a variety of housing types: single family detached or attached dwelling units; duets; townhomes; condominiums; or, apartments on varying lot sizes, to address multiple demographics, pricing, and market segments.
- **Transportation Choices:** The No Action alternative would encourage people to utilize alternative modes of transportation. Bus services provided by Roseville Transit and Placer County Transit would be extended to the project site and these transit providers would utilize the circulation system provided under the No Action alternative to provide local and regional transit connections for community residents. In addition, the No Action alternative would provide an extensive network of multiple-use trails and paseos, which could be used by pedestrians and bicyclists to access open space and recreational facilities, and provide connectivity to the existing and planned City pedestrian and bike lane network.
- **Natural Resource Conservation:** The No Action alternative proposes to preserve approximately 326 acres of open space area, comprised of 38.6 acres of waters of the U.S., including a clay-flat vernal pool complex and portions of University Creek. Designated open space areas would conserve and protect natural resources, including threatened and endangered species habitat. All open space and public uses would be designated and sized consistent with General Plan policies and standards.
- **Mixed-Use Developments:** The No Action alternative includes a balanced mix of residential and commercial uses in close proximity to each other that promotes walking or bike riding to neighborhood functions and services. Additionally, the Village Commercial District would have a zoning designation of mixed use

commercial that is intended to provide a mix and density of commercial, office, and residential uses common to an urban setting or traditional downtown.

- Use of Existing Assets: The project site is immediately adjacent to existing and proposed urban development; and therefore, would be able to utilize existing infrastructure; minimizing the amount of roadway and utilities expansion required.

The Preferred Blueprint Scenario was used as the starting point in the development of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The SCS included land use maps identifying areas that SACOG considered appropriate for development. The ARSP area was included in these maps as a “developing community.” SACOG characterized “developing communities”, such as Amoruso Ranch, 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.” As the SCS designates the project site for development, growth at the site pursuant to the No Action alternative would be generally consistent with the strategy; however, approximately 40 percent fewer housing units would be constructed under the No Action alternative than under the Proposed Action.

Based on the information above, the No Action alternative would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint or the SCS. Therefore, **no direct** or **indirect** effects as a result of conflicts with the SACOG Blueprint and SCS under the No Action alternative were identified.

As no wetland mitigation would be necessary under the No Action alternative, **no direct** or **indirect** effects related to conflicts with the SACOG Blueprint and SCS were identified.

**Proposed
Action**

The Proposed Action would develop a large-scale, 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 than the No Action alternative, including 2,826 dwelling units, which represents a 75 percent increase in dwelling units when compared to the No Action alternative. The Proposed Action would also include 51 acres of commercial development, which represents a 75 percent increase in commercial development when compared to the No Action alternative. As a result, the Proposed Action would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint by providing additional opportunities for meeting SACOG Blueprint objectives due to its higher density of mixed-use development. In addition, as noted above, the ARSP was included in the SCS’s planning projections and was designated as a developing community in the SCS. Thus, the Proposed Action would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint or the SCS. Based upon this information, **no direct** or **indirect** effects as

a result of conflicts with the SACOG Blueprint and SCS under the Proposed Action were identified.

The use of the mitigation sites to provide compensatory mitigation for the Proposed Action's impacts on WOUS and special status species would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint and the SCS because these lands are not identified in those plans for land development. **No direct or indirect** effects related to conflicts with the SACOG Blueprint and SCS were identified.

Alts. 1, 2, 3

As with the Proposed Action, Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would develop large-scale, mixed-use, mixed-density urban communities on the project site and would include all the various smart growth elements listed above under the No Action alternative, which would make each alternative consistent with the SACOG Blueprint Objectives. Therefore, Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint. In addition, Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would provide between 2,308 to 2,730 dwelling units, which represents a 37 to 63 percent increase in dwelling units, when compared to the No Action alternative; and would provide between approximately 51 and 58 acres of commercial development, which represents a 75 to 98 percent increase in non-residential space, when compared to the No Action alternative. As a result, Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 would provide additional opportunities for meeting SACOG Blueprint objectives due to their higher density of mixed-use development. In addition, as noted above, the ARSP was included in the SCS's planning projections and was designated as a developing community in the SCS. Therefore, Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint or the SCS. Based on this information, **no direct or indirect** effects as a result of conflicts with the SACOG Blueprint or SCS under Alternatives 1, 2, or 3 were identified.

The use of the mitigation sites to provide compensatory mitigation for the impacts of Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 on WOUS and special status species would not conflict with the SACOG Blueprint and the SCS because these lands are not identified in those plans for land development. **No direct or indirect** effects related to conflicts with the SACOG Blueprint and SCS were identified.

3.12.5 REFERENCES

City of Roseville. 2016. *Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan*. May.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). 2016. *2016 MTP/SCS*. February.