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Appendix 1

ADOPTING RESOLUTIONS
RESOLUTION NO. 16-272

AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN TO CHANGE THE TEXT AND
LAND USE DESIGNATIONS ON CERTAIN PROPERTY IN
THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE RELATED TO THE
AMORUSO RANCH SPECIFIC PLAN

WHEREAS, a proposal has been submitted to amend the General Plan of the City of Roseville by changing the permitted land uses on certain property located within the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Area; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held public hearings on the proposed General Plan amendments on March 10, 2016 and April 14, 2016; and

WHEREAS, on June 15, 2016, the City Council held a public hearing at which time the proposed amendments were considered; and

WHEREAS, on June 15, 2016, the City Council certified that the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 2013102057), Volumes 1-4, consisting of the Draft EIR, Technical Appendices, Text Changes and Responses to Comments ("Final EIR"), was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq.; adopted and incorporated into the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan project all of the mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Roseville that are identified in the Findings; and adopted the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan for all of the mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Roseville; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has independently considered the significant environmental effects of the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan as shown in the certified Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Council desires to approve the proposed amendments to the Roseville General Plan as conducive to public interest, health, safety and welfare, and consistent with the land use practices of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville as follows:

1. The City Council hereby amends the land use map of the City of Roseville General Plan by changing the General Plan text and by changing land use designations as shown in Exhibit "C-1" (hereby described as General Plan 2035), on file with the City Clerk and incorporated herein by reference;

2. The Development Services Director is hereby directed to retain said General Plan Amendment on permanent public display in the Planning Division of the City of Roseville.
PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this June 15, 2016, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Gore, Rohan, Herman, Roccucci, Garcia

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None

City Clerk

MAYOR
RESOLUTION NO. 10-161

AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN TO CHANGE THE TEXT AND LAND USE DESIGNATIONS ON CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a proposal has been submitted to amend the General Plan of the City of Roseville by changing the permitted land uses on certain property located in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held public hearings on the proposed General Plan amendments on December 10, 2009, January 18, 2010, January 28, 2010, and April 22, 2010; and

WHEREAS, on May 5, 2010, the City Council held a public hearing at which time the proposed amendments were considered; and

WHEREAS, on May 5, 2010, the City Council certified that the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 200832115), Volumes 1-8, consisting of the Draft EIR, Technical Appendices, Text Changes and Responses to Comments (“Final EIR”), was completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq.; adopted and incorporated into the Sierra Vista Specific Plan project all of the mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Roseville that are identified in the Findings; and adopted the Mitigation Monitoring Program for the Sierra Vista Specific Plan for all of the mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Roseville; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has independently considered the significant environmental effects of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan as shown in the certified Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Council desires to approve said amendments to the Roseville General Plan as conducive to public interest, health, safety and welfare, and consistent with the land use practices of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville as follows:

1. The City Council hereby amends the land use map of the City of Roseville General Plan by changing the General Plan text and by changing land use designations as shown in Exhibit “C-1” (hereby described as General Plan 2025), attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference;

2. The Planning Director is hereby directed to retain said General Plan Amendment on permanent public display in the Planning Department of the City of Roseville.
PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this May 5, 2010 by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Allard, Gray, Garcia, Garbolino

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: Roccucci

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None

City Clerk

MAYOR

2
RESOLUTION NO. 04-39

AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN TO CHANGE THE TEXT AND LAND USE DESIGNATIONS ON CERTAIN PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE

WHEREAS, a proposal has been submitted to amend the General Plan of the City of Roseville by changing the permitted land uses on certain property located in the West Roseville Specific Plan Area; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed General Plan amendments on October 9, 2003, November 6, 2003, November 13, 2003, December 4, 2003 and January 8, 2004; and

WHEREAS, on January 21, 2004, the City Council held a public hearing at which time the proposed amendments were considered; and

WHEREAS, on January 21, 2004, the City Council certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the West Roseville Specific Plan and Sphere of Influence Amendment (State Clearinghouse No. 2002082057), Volumes I-VI, consisting of the Draft EIR, Technical Appendices, Text Changes and Responses to Comments (“Final EIR”); and

WHEREAS, the City Council has independently considered the significant environmental effects of the West Roseville Specific Plan and Sphere of Influence Amendment (“Project”) as shown in the certified Final EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Council desires to approve said amendments to the Roseville General Plan as conducive to public interest, health, safety and welfare, and consistent with the land use practices of the City,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville as follows:

1. That the City Council hereby adopts the CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations of the City of Roseville (“Findings”), attached hereto as Exhibit “A,” on file with the City Clerk, for the Project.

2. That the City Council hereby adopts and makes a condition of the Project approval all of the mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Roseville which are identified in the Findings.

3. That the City Council hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program for West Roseville Specific Plan and Sphere of Influence Amendment (“Mitigation Monitoring Program”), Exhibit “B” on file with the City Clerk, for the Project, for all of the mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City of Roseville.
4. Having independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, adopted the mitigation measures and made them conditions of approval, adopted the Mitigation Monitoring Program, and adopted the Findings, the City Council hereby amends the land use map of the City of Roseville General Plan by changing the General Plan text and by changing land use designations for certain property as shown in Appendix U of the Final EIR, attached as Exhibit "C" hereto and incorporated herein by reference; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Director is hereby directed to retain said General Plan Amendment on permanent public display in the Planning Department of the City of Roseville; and be it

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this Feb. 4, 2004 by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: John Allard, Jim Gray, Gina Garbolino, and Rocky Rockholm

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: Richard Rocucci

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None

Signed ____________________________
City Clerk

Signed ____________________________
MAYOR
RESOLUTION NO. 03-1

AMENDMENT TO GENERAL PLAN TO INCORPORATE
TECHNICAL UPDATES

WHEREAS, since 1992 the City Council has taken actions and approvals that have affected the General Plan of the City of Roseville; and

WHEREAS, staff desired to update the Elements of the General Plan to incorporate these actions (technical updates); and

WHEREAS, on October 24, 2002 the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed technical updates to the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, on November 21, 2002, a publicly noticed Study Session was held to provide additional information and an opportunity to address questions and comments from the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the technical updates do not result in any General Plan changes that have not previously been approved by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to approve said technical updates to the Roseville General Plan as conducive to public health, safety and welfare, and consistent with the land use practices of the City,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Roseville that this Amendment to General Plan incorporating the technical updates of the General Plan, including the Introduction, Land Use, Circulation, Air Quality, Open Space and Conservation, Parks and Recreation, Public Facilities and Safety Elements of the City of Roseville General Plan is hereby approved and is on file with the City Clerk; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Director is hereby directed to insert said General Plan Amendment into permanent copy of the General Plan on file with the City Clerk.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this Jan. 8, 2003 by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS: Earl Rush, Richard Roccucci, Gina Garbolino, Jim Gray, Rocky Rockholm

NOES COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None

Mayor

City Clerk
RESOLUTION NO. 92-321

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE
ADOPTING THE ROSEVILLE GENERAL PLAN
AND REPEALING FORMER GENERAL PLANS

WHEREAS, Section 65300 of the Government Code of the State
of California provides that each City shall adopt a General Plan; and

WHEREAS, in 1977 the City of Roseville adopted a general
plan which has been amended from time to time; and

WHEREAS, the said general plan has become outdated and in
need of replacement; and

WHEREAS, the City Council appointed an ad hoc General Plan
Committee to advise it regarding the adoption of a replacement
general plan; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan Committee, Transportation
Commission, Public Utilities Commission, Parks and Recreation
Commission and the Planning Commission of the City of Roseville
have each held numerous public hearings over a period lasting
more than two (2) years at which a proposed 2010 General Plan was
considered, and each has recommended that said proposed 2010
General Plan be adopted; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has held public hearings on the
proposed 2010 General Plan on October 21, 1992, October 28, 1992,
and November 18, 1992 at which evidence and testimony regarding
the proposed 2010 General Plan was received and considered; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds and determines that it is in
the best interest of the public health, safety and welfare to
adopt said proposed 2010 General Plan; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution no. 92-320, adopted November
18, 1992, the City Council has previously certified an
Environmental Impact Report for the proposed 2010 General Plan
pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of
Roseville as follows:

1. The proposed 2010 General Plan is hereby adopted as
"The General Plan of the City of Roseville".
2. The Planning Director, is hereby directed to cause the printing and binding of the General Plan, and to file a copy thereof with the City Clerk.

3. The former general plan and all of its amendments are hereby repealed.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Council of the City of Roseville this 16th day of November, 1992, by the following vote on roll call:

AYES COUNCILMEMBERS:  Fred M. Jackson, Harry Crabb, Jr., Mel Hamei, Bill Santucci
NOES COUNCILMEMBERS:  Pauline Roccocci
ABSENT COUNCILMEMBERS: None

ATTEST:

[Signature]
City Clerk

[Signature]
MAYOR
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REFERENCES
REFERENCES

The following documents were used in the preparation of the General Plan. This information can be obtained through the Planning Department.

1. General Plan Update Issue Papers
   a. Schools, December 1990
   b. Public Facilities, January 1991
   c. Open Space & Conservation, March 1991
   d. Urban Reserve, May 1991
   e. Parks & Recreation, June 1991
   f. Housing, July 1991
   g. Safety, September 1991
   h. Circulation, October-November 1991
   i. Air Quality, December 1991
   j. Land Use, February 1992

2. Angus McDonald - Marketing Analysis for the Traffic Model, December 1991

3. Roseville General Plan (1977 and other amendments)

4. Southeast Roseville Specific Plan and EIR

5. Northeast Roseville Specific Plan and EIR

6. Northwest Roseville Specific Plan and EIR

7. North Central Roseville Specific Plan and EIR

8. Del Webb Specific Plan and EIR

9. North Roseville Specific Plan and EIR

10. Highland Reserve Specific Plan and EIR

11. Stoneridge Specific Plan and EIR

12. Parks and Recreation Comprehensive Master Plan

13. Bicycle Master Plan

14. Planning Department Quarterly Reports

15. City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance

16. West Roseville Specific Plan and EIR

17. Riverside Gateway Specific Plan and EIR

18. Downtown Roseville Specific Plan and EIR

19. Sierra Vista Specific Plan and EIR

20. Creekview Specific Plan and EIR
Appendix 3

HOUSING ELEMENT APPENDIX
# APPENDIX 3-A

## 1. TOTAL SUBSIDY CALCULATIONS (RENTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>80% Median</th>
<th>60% Median</th>
<th>50% Median</th>
<th>30% Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Bedroom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized</td>
<td>$793</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>$496</td>
<td>$297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Bedroom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>$982</td>
<td>$982</td>
<td>$982</td>
<td>$982</td>
<td>$982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized</td>
<td>$953</td>
<td>$714</td>
<td>$595</td>
<td>$357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Bedroom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>$1,220</td>
<td>$1,220</td>
<td>$1,220</td>
<td>$1,220</td>
<td>$1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized</td>
<td>$1,110</td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$668</td>
<td>$413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Laundry ($7.00 unit/mo.)  $12,600 $12,600 $12,600 $12,600 $12,600

Gross Revenues    1,684,440 1,674,696 1,592,472 1,551,120 1,469,712

Less Vacancy Rate *(4.5%)  75,800 75,361 71,661 69,800 66,137

Net Operating Income 1,608,640 1,599,335 1,520,811 1,481,320 1,403,575

Appraised Value (8.5%) 18,925,176 18,815,706 17,891,894 17,427,294 16,512,647

Loss of Value** 109,470 1,033,282 1,497,882 2,412,529

Loss of Value per Unit*** 3,649 34,443 49,929 80,418

---

* 2000 Census Data
** Value of market rate complex minus values of subsidized complex
*** Loss of value divided by affordable units (30).

Subsidized rent levels are equivalent to 30% of the median income for each income category.
2. **SUBSIDY RANGES (RENTS)**

- **3,048** units at 30% to 50% Median (Very Low-Income Units)
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{Required Subsidy} & = 49,929 \\
  \text{Units} & = 3,048 \\
  \text{Range} & = 152,183,592 \\
  \end{align*}
  \]

- **1,729** units at 60% to 80% Median (Low-Income Units)
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{Required Subsidy} & = 3,649 \\
  \text{Units} & = 1,729 \\
  \text{Range} & = 6,309,121 \\
  \end{align*}
  \]

- **1,167** units at 80% to 100% Median (Moderate-Income Units)
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{Required Subsidy} & = 0 \\
  \text{Units} & = 1,167 \\
  \text{Range} & = 0 \\
  \end{align*}
  \]

- **Total Subsidy Range 2002–2007** (5,944 total units)
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{Very Low-Income} & = 152,183,592 \\
  \text{Low-Income} & = 6,309,121 \\
  \text{Moderate-Income} & = 0 \\
  \text{Range} & = 158,492,713 \\
  \text{Maximum} & = 245,114,064 \\
  \text{Minimum} & = 59,551,947 \\
  \text{Range} & = 308,924,394 \\
  \text{Divided by 2} & = 233,708,553.50
  \end{align*}
  \]

3. **Average Subsidy Calculations (RENTS)**

**Very Low Income Average Rent Subsidy**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Required Subsidy} & = 80,418 \\
\text{Range} & = 130,347 \\
\text{Divided by 2} & = 65,173
\end{align*}
\]

**Low Income Average Rent Subsidy**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Required Subsidy} & = 34,443 \\
\text{Range} & = 38,092 \\
\text{Divided by 2} & = 19,046
\end{align*}
\]
4. Subsidy Calculations (Purchase)

In the City’s recent HOME application for affordable housing purchase, a subsidy of approximately $25,000 for 80% of the median and $40,000 for 60% or less of the median per purchase unit will be necessary to bring the market price of a 3 bedroom/2 bath single family detached home affordable to middle and low-income homebuyers per the following assumptions:

- Market value of the home is $155,000 average project cost.
- Assuming 97% financing at 9% interest.
- Purchase home is a resale in an older section of the City.
- No underlying Mellow-Roos or Lighting/Landscape District assessments.
APPENDIX 3-B

DENSITY BONUS SUBSIDY VALUE CALCULATIONS

Density Bonus units have a subsidy value equivalent to the increase in Net Operating Income/unit caused by addition of the Density Bonus Unit.

Net Operating Income/unit is calculated by comparing the annual payment associated with the financing of a unit with the gross income produced by that unit.

- Using portions of a pro-forma from a recently developed project the Total Cost/unit is calculated as follows:

  Total Development Costs   $ 16,781,609
  Less: Land Costs         $  922,989
  Total Cost/unit          $ 15,858,620
  divided by 150 units =    105,724 Cost per unit

  (Land costs will not increase with the addition of density bonus units)

- Financing associated with Total Cost/unit is based on a 30 year loan at 9% covering 100% of cost. Annual Payments on a $105,724 loan would be $10,132.

- Gross Income is derived as follows:

  Mean rent (weighed)   $ 1090 X 12 months =   $ 13,080
  Laundry               $  7 X 12 months =     84
  Gross Income/unit/year $ 13,164

- Net Operating Income is equal to Gross Income – Annual Loan Payments.

  Gross Income          $ 13,164
  Loan Payments         - 10,132
  Net Operating Income  $  3,032

Density Bonus Units, therefore, have a subsidy value of $3,032/unit.
## APPENDIX 3-C

### QUANTIFIED OBJECTIVES BY INCOME GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Low 50% or Less</th>
<th>Low 50% – 80%</th>
<th>Middle 80% - 100%</th>
<th>Moderate 100% - 120%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>2,118</td>
<td>*4,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 8</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Program</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Private</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units at Risk</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>686</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>5,702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unit Conservation

- Condominium Conversion Ordinance: 5, 5, 10, 30, 50
- Project Go Weatherization: 278, 185, 0, 0, 463
- Building Codes: 500, 1,500, 1,000, 1,000, 4,000
- Roseville Electric Rate Discount: 900, 0, 0, 0, 900
- Roseville Voucher Program: 75, 0, 0, 0, 75
- Handyman Program: 375, 125, 0, 0, 500
- Paint Program: 20, 80, 0, 0, 100
- Down Payment Assistance Program: 10, 35, 0, 0, 45
- Cal Rural Gold: 20, 40, 0, 0, 60
- Reserve Unit Pool/Density Bonus: 20, 245, 113, 0, 378
- Affordable Housing Agreements: 67, 1,024, 478, 0, 1,569
- Hospital Fund: 2,375, 0, 0, 0, 2,375

**Subtotal**: 4,645, 3,239, 1,601, 1,030, 10,515

**Grand Total**: 5,331, 4,233, 3,441, 3,212, 16,217
### APPENDIX 3-D

#### 1. RESIDENTIAL USE TYPE AND PERMIT REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENTIAL USE</th>
<th>R-1 Single Family Residential</th>
<th>RS Small Lot Residential</th>
<th>R-2 Two-Family Residential</th>
<th>R-3 Attached Residential</th>
<th>RMU Mixed Use Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Dwellings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooming and Boarding House</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Family</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family Dwellings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Residential Units</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Care Facility, Small</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Care Facility, Large</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Day Care Homes, Small</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Day Care Homes, Large</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M1*</th>
<th>M2*</th>
<th>MMU*</th>
<th>GC*</th>
<th>HC*</th>
<th>CMU*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Resident Shelter</td>
<td>A/CUP</td>
<td>A/CUP</td>
<td>A/CUP</td>
<td>A/CUP</td>
<td>A/CUP</td>
<td>A/CUP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMERCIAL USE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NC*</th>
<th>CC*</th>
<th>GC*</th>
<th>HC*</th>
<th>RC*</th>
<th>CBD*</th>
<th>CMU*</th>
<th>HD*</th>
<th>BP*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family Dwellings</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretaker/Employee Housing</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Room Occupant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Care Facility</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Care Facility</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CUP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principally permitted use, designated as “P”  
Conditionally permitted use, designated as “CUP”  
Administratively permitted use, designated as “A”  
Primary Use Types not listed or designated by a dash (–) are not permitted in that zone district.  
*Definitions for Use Types are located in the Housing Element Appendix 3-E.

#### 2. LAND USE DENSITIES AND DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE DENSITIES</th>
<th>DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>0.5 to 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>7.0 to 12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>13.0 and Above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. PERMITTED LAND USE DESIGNATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R-1 Single Family Residential</th>
<th>RS Small Lot Residential</th>
<th>R-2 Two-Family Residential</th>
<th>R-3 Attached Residential</th>
<th>RMU Mixed Use Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>6,000 sq ft</td>
<td>4,500 sq ft</td>
<td>6,000 sq ft</td>
<td>6,000 sq ft</td>
<td>See Develop. Stds. or Special Area Overlay Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size (sq. ft.)</td>
<td>7,500 sq ft</td>
<td>5,500 sq ft</td>
<td>7,500 sq ft</td>
<td>7,500 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width, Interior</td>
<td>60 ft</td>
<td>45 ft</td>
<td>60 ft</td>
<td>60 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width, Corner</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>55 ft</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td>75 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Front Yard Setbacks</td>
<td>20 ft for interior lots;</td>
<td>15 ft Front;</td>
<td>20 ft for interior lots;</td>
<td>20 ft minimum on all street frontages</td>
<td>As provided in Development Standard Overlay or Special Area Overlay District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 ft for corner lots;</td>
<td>20 ft minimum driveway depth</td>
<td>15 ft for corner lots;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 ft minimum driveways depth</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 ft minimum driveways depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Side Yard Setbacks</td>
<td>5 ft interior; 12.5 ft street side on corner</td>
<td>5 ft interior; 15 ft street side on corner</td>
<td>5 ft interior; 15 ft street side on corner</td>
<td>5 ft; 20 ft minimum on all street frontages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 ft street side on corner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Rear Yard Setbacks</td>
<td>20% of lot depth; need not exceed 20 ft; 10 ft minimum</td>
<td>15 ft minimum with minimum usable open space provided</td>
<td>20% of lot depth; need not exceed 20 ft; 10 ft minimum</td>
<td>20 ft minimum on all street frontages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>35% for 2 story; 40% for 1 story</td>
<td>35% for 2 story; 40% for 1 story</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Limit</td>
<td>35 ft</td>
<td>35 ft</td>
<td>35 ft</td>
<td>35 ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Requirements</td>
<td>2 per Dwelling</td>
<td>2 per Dwelling</td>
<td>2 per Dwelling</td>
<td>*1.5 spaces per unit for 1 Bedroom or 2 per unit for 2+ Bedrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Guest Parking in projects with 10 or more dwelling units shall provide 1 additional space for each 10 dwelling units or portion thereof.

Setbacks and maximum coverage requirements are similar to those in other communities and are not considered a constraint to the development of affordable housing.
## 4. PERMIT PROCESSING PROCEDURES AND TIMELINE ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Permit</td>
<td>Approved by the Planning Director. Public Hearing before Planning Commission. Processing time 4 to 12 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Use Permit</td>
<td>Public Hearing before Planning Commission. Processing time between 8 and 12 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Review Permit for Multi-family Construction Projects</td>
<td>Public Hearing before Design Committee or Planning Commission. Processing time about 16 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Encroachment Permit</td>
<td>Public Hearing before Planning Commission. Processing time between 8 and 12 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Project Permits</td>
<td>Public Hearing before Planning Commission for processing Stage 1 (Preliminary Development Plan), Stage 2 (Architectural and Landscaping Plan), staff approval of Stage 3 (Final Plans). Processing time 16 to 20 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative Subdivision Maps</td>
<td>Public Hearing before Planning Commission. Processing time is between 12 and 16 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Review Permits for Residential Subdivisions</td>
<td>Should be obtained concurrent or following processing an application for a tentative residential subdivision map or as a separate permit when modifying existing design standards. Public Hearing before Planning Commission. Processing time 8 to 12 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading Plan/Permits</td>
<td>Planning Director approval for Minor Grading Plans or Public Hearing before Planning Commission for Major Grading Plans. Processing time is between 4 and 12 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Permits</td>
<td>Planning Director approval of Administrative Tree Permits or Public Hearing before Planning Commission or Design Committee if the tree is associated with a Design Review Permit. Processing time between 8 and 12 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Public Hearing before Planning Commission or Design Review. Processing time between 8 and 12 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rezone</td>
<td>Public Hearing by both Planning Commission and City Council. Processing time is between 16 and 20 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Public Hearing by both the Planning Commission and City Council. Processing time between 16 and 20 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Public Hearing by both the Planning Commission and City Council. Processing time between 16 and 20 weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Line Adjustment</td>
<td>Planning Director approval or Public Hearing before Planning Commission. Processing time between 4 and 12 weeks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESIDENTIAL ZONES

A. **Single-Family Residential (R1) District.** The R-1, Single-Family Residential district is intended for detached, single-family homes and similar and related uses inclusive of half-plexes.

B. **Small Lot Residential (RS) District.** The R-S, Small Lot Residential district is intended to allow either attached or detached single-family dwellings, and similar and related compatible uses.

C. **Two-Family Residential (R2) District.** The R-2, Two-Family Residential district is intended to allow two dwellings per lot, either detached single-family dwellings or duplexes, and similar and related compatible uses.

D. **Attached Housing (R3) District.** The R-3, Attached Housing district is intended for multiple-family housing. The types of land use intended for the R-3 zoning district include apartments, condominiums, town homes, and similar and related compatible uses.

E. **Residential Mixed Use (RMU) District.** The Residential Mixed-Use district is intended to promote a variety of residential uses/dwelling types and the flexible citing of uses that are typically considered to be compatible with residential development.

COMMERCIAL ZONES

A. **Business Professional (BP) District.** The Business Professional district is intended to provide locations for a wide variety of office uses and other uses which are related to and supportive of office uses.

B. **Neighborhood Commercial (NC) District.** The Neighborhood Commercial district is intended to be applied to properties in close proximity to residential areas providing for convenient retail and personal service facilities.

C. **Community Commercial (CC) District.** The Community Commercial district is intended to serve the principal retail shopping needs of the entire community by providing areas for shopping centers, and other retail and service uses.

D. **General Commercial (GC) District.** The General Commercial district is intended to serve the entire community by providing areas for commercial facilities that are more of a service or heavy commercial character than are permitted in the Community Commercial District, and may involve outdoor display, storage or activity areas.

E. **Highway Commercial (HC) District.** The Highway Commercial district is intended to be applied where commercial facilities serving the traveling public are necessary or desirable.

F. **Regional Commercial (RC) District.** The Regional Commercial district is intended to provide for commercial facilities serving Roseville and the greater South Placer Area.

G. **Central Business (CBD) District.** The Central Business district is intended to be applied to the older portions of the downtown area to provide flexibility in the types of uses typically found in the
traditional downtown where a range of business and service, residential, and mixed use uses can be located to support the entire community.

H. Commercial Mixed Use (CMU) District. The Commercial Mixed Use district is intended to promote a variety of commercial uses types and the flexible citing of other uses that are typically considered to be compatible with commercial development. It is the intent of the CMU zoning district to establish a mix of uses, which will be accompanied by overlay zones, to ensure that different commercial uses will be successfully integrated into desirable, cohesive commercial districts. The CMU zoning district shall always be applied in conjunction with either the DS (Development Standards) or SA (Special Area) overlay zones.

I. Old Town Historic (HD) District. The Old Town Historic district is intended to be applied to the original commercial core of Roseville to acknowledge its historic and architectural significance. The HD zoning district is intended to ensure that new land uses and development within the district further the rehabilitation, revitalization, and preservation of the architectural, aesthetic, historic and economic health of the district. Each parcel within a Historic District shall be subject to the specific Historic district design guidelines contained within the City’s Community Design Guidelines as adopted by the City Council from time to time. Whenever a Design Review Permit is required for development of a parcel within the Historic District zone, the Historic District guidelines shall apply.

INDUSTRIAL ZONES

A. Light Industrial (M1) District. The Light Industrial district is intended to designate areas appropriate for light industrial uses such as manufacturing, processing, assembly, high technology, research and development and storage uses. The use types permitted within the M-1 district do not include outdoor manufacturing but may include limited outdoor storage and the emission of limited amount of visible gasses, particulates, steam, heat, odor, vibration, glare, dust, and noise. These uses may be compatible operating in relatively close proximity to commercial and residential uses.

B. General Industrial (M2) District. The General Industrial district is intended to designate areas suitable for a broad range of industrial uses including manufacturing, assembly, wholesale distribution, and warehousing.

C. Industrial Mixed Use (MMU) District. This district is intended to promote a variety of industrial use types and the flexible citing of uses that are typically considered to be compatible with industrial development. It is the intent of the MMU zoning district to establish a mix of uses, which will be accompanied by overlay zones, to ensure that different industrial uses will be successfully integrated into desirable, cohesive industrial districts. The MMU zoning district shall always be applied in conjunction with either the -DS (Development Standards) or -SA (Special Area) overlay zones as described in Chapter 19.18.
During the last week of March 2002, Sergei Shkurkin and Associates, LLC, conducted a “point-in-time” census of homeless individuals and families in Placer County, California. The survey instrument used was an 89-item questionnaire based on input from service providers and representatives of Placer County public entities. The purpose of the census was to provide an accurate picture of Placer County’s homeless population for policy formulation and program planning. The figures we report here are accurate for the week of the count. They give a statistically accurate picture of Placer County’s non-seasonal homeless population.

The main findings of the census are as follows:

Totals: At the time of the count there were 405 homeless people in Placer County. This count includes 109 women and 88 children.

Gender: The ratio of men to women in Placer’s homeless population is lower than in other jurisdictions (2:1 versus 3:1).

Age: The median age of Placer’s homeless population is 41 years, three years older than the general population of Placer County and five years older than California as a whole.

Race: The racial breakdown of Placer County’s homeless population approximately mirrors that of the County as a whole, with an overwhelming white majority, seven percent Hispanic, and two percent African American.

Education: Thirty percent dropped out of school before completing 12th grade, but 36% did complete high school, and 25% finished two years of college.

Sources of Support: Eleven percent of the homeless report that they are working at a regular job. One hundred fifty-one adults (37%) in the survey receive one or more types of government assistance, while 102 (38%) receive no assistance and have no work.

Shelter: A little more than half of Placer County’s homeless population is sheltered in transitional housing. The rest are unsheltered. We define unsheltered as those living outside in places not meant for human habitation, such as cars, parks, sidewalks, and abandoned buildings. Of the unsheltered, 53 (43%) said they had declined services because of rules and regulations.

Geographic Mobility: More than half of Placer’s homeless population is geographically stable. Those whose last move was within Placer County lived an average of 12 years in the community where they were interviewed. Those whose most recent move was from outside the county had lived in their Placer County communities for 6 years.

Alcohol and Drug Use: The vast majority of adult interviewees, 242 out of 271 (89%), indicated current or past problems with alcohol or drugs. One hundred nine (45%) admitted actively abusing drugs or alcohol at the time of the survey. This is consistent with findings from other homeless studies.

Mental Illness: Almost half of the interviewees, 121 (45%), report having been diagnosed as mentally ill. Again, this is consistent with homeless populations elsewhere.

Other Health Problems: A similar proportion, 124 (46%), report a range of other health problems that had bothered them in the days before the interview.

Veterans: Fifty (18%) of the homeless were military veterans.

Delivery of Social Services: The public and non-profit agencies in the County are delivering a range of social services to the homeless population. Forty-nine percent of the interviewees said they knew a social worker or caseworker to whom they could turn for help. Over 70% of those reporting mental problems (92 of 121) are receiving special assistance. Ninety-one (34%) of the homeless surveyed reported that they refused services. The identification of this hard-to-serve group is important information for those planning services, as they present a special challenge to service providers.

Dreams and Aspirations: When asked what they really wanted, 112 (34%) said they would
like to have work, or a better job, and 82 (30%) said they wanted a good home. Only 27 (10%) said they preferred to remain homeless.

**Comparison of Auburn and Roseville:** The largest homeless populations are found in the greater Auburn area (127 or 46%) and Roseville (127 or 46%). The characteristics of the homeless in the two communities are very different. In Auburn, the homeless are better educated and have fewer children. Auburn also has more mentally ill. In Roseville, there is higher drug use, a higher proportion of veterans, and the homeless are twice as likely to be unsheltered or live outside. We found no difference between the two communities in the numbers of homeless who are working, and in other sources of support.

**The Average Placer County Homeless Person** is a 41 year old white male who was graduated from high school and may have some college education. This individual is out of work but in the past has worked at jobs averaging up to $12.00 per hour. He is most likely either sleeping outside, or in supportive transitional housing. He has lived in his current community an average of 7.8 years. He is equally likely to live in Auburn or in Roseville. Placer County's average homeless person has current or past problems with drugs (mainly marijuana) or alcohol, and reports to have made serious attempts to end his substance abuse. If he has successfully ended his drug use, he will have been "clean and sober" for an average of 3.6 years. There is almost a 50/50 chance that the homeless individual suffers from mental illness, most likely some form of clinical depression. There is also about a 50/50 chance that he is suffering from a physical ailment, most probably associated with physical trauma. There is a greater than one-in-three chance that he will have been sexually or physically abused as a child. He dreams of having a stable home (either an apartment in town or a cabin in the woods), finding work, and of going on vacation.

The report provides additional comparisons between the sheltered and unsheltered homeless populations, and between veterans and single non-veterans. There are also special descriptions of homeless pet ownership, and the most in need among the homeless, which we defined as unsheltered individuals who had drug problems and a diagnosis of mental illness.
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