4.1 LAND USE PLANNING AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

4.1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes potential impacts to existing land uses, including agricultural uses, in the Planning Area associated with the proposed General Plan Update. To provide context for the impact analysis, this section begins with an environmental setting describing the existing land uses and land use designations in the Planning Area. Next, the regulatory framework is described, which informs the selection of the significance thresholds used in the impact analysis. The regulatory framework also includes existing General Plan policies related to the impact analysis of this chapter. The section concludes with the applicable significance thresholds, the impacts of the proposed changes to adopted Land Use Element policies, recommended mitigation measures, and the significance conclusion.

The land use impact analysis relies primarily on an examination of existing land uses and adopted plans that affect land use planning, such as the City’s General Plan land use plan, the California Department of Conservation’s Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, and the Sacramento Area Council of Government’s Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The proposed General Plan Update is compared with these plans for areas of conflict or impact.

As part of the impact analysis, NOP comments were reviewed to help guide the analysis, and any comments were integrated into the analysis. However, no NOP comments related to land use planning or agricultural resources were received.

4.1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

4.1.2.1 PLANNING AREA

Roseville is the largest city in Placer County and is located 15 miles northeast of downtown Sacramento. Roseville is surrounded by agricultural uses in unincorporated Placer County to the west, the cities of Rocklin to the north and Citrus Heights to the south, and the unincorporated communities of Antelope to the southwest and Granite Bay to the east. Exhibit 2-1 in Chapter 2, “Project Description,” shows Roseville in its regional context.

The Planning Area for this proposed General Plan Update includes all areas within the City limits and those areas outside City limits that are within the City’s Sphere of Influence (see Exhibit 2-2 in Chapter 2). The Planning Area is approximately 29,000 acres or 45 square miles in total land area.

4.1.2.2 EXISTING LAND USE AND LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

Within the City limits, there are 16 subareas that have been defined for planning purposes. These are the Infill Area, the North Industrial Area, and the City’s 14 Specific Plan Areas. The City’s 14 Specific Plan Areas are shown in Exhibit 4.1-1 and further described under Section 4.1.3.3, “Regional and Local.” The Infill Area has vacant and underutilized properties where the City will encourage infill opportunity areas, but overall is mostly built out. The North Industrial Area is a planning subarea of the City that provides a major opportunity for industrial and employment development serving the south Placer region.

Development in the vicinity of Interstate 80 and State Route 65 consists primarily of relatively large-scale commercial, office, and industrial uses. Single-family residential neighborhoods with some multi-family
development occupy the remainder of the Planning Area to the north, west, and east. Residential development in the vicinity of Interstate 80, near the southern Planning Area boundary, consists of older single-family homes on relatively small to medium sized lots, interspersed with commercial development, parks, and schools.

The City has assigned land use designations to most portions of the Planning Area, with the exception of major road rights-of-way and developed areas that are outside the City limits, but within the City’s Sphere of Influence (see Exhibit 2-3 in Chapter 2). The City assumes buildout of the Planning Area with the approximate acreages per land use designation as shown in Table 4.1-1. The General Plan Update does not propose changes to land use designations; therefore, land use designations shown in Table 4.1-1 are the same in the existing General Plan and the proposed General Plan Update.

Within the existing developed portions of the City’s Planning Area, residential development occupies approximately 30 percent of the total land area and vacant land accounts for another 20 percent. Public uses, open space, and recreational uses occupy approximately 20 percent of the Planning Area. Approximately 15 percent of the Planning Area is dedicated to road rights-of-way. Commercial and industrial land occupies approximately 10 percent of the Planning Area. The balance of the Planning Area is currently in agricultural production.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1-1</th>
<th>Acreage by General Plan Land Use Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designation</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Density Residential</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Density Residential</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Density Residential</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Commercial</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Commercial</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Professional</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>1,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech/Business Park</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Industrial</td>
<td>1,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Station</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Business District</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Quasi-Public</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>2,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Reserve</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Totals do not add due to rounding. The total acreage does not include approximately 3,000 acres in the Planning Area of undesignated road rights-of-way and other undesignated land.
4.1.2.3 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Row crops, grain crops, orchards, and grassland that supports livestock grazing is located north of Baseline Road, in the western and northwestern portions of the Planning Area. The Creekview, Amoruso Ranch, and Sierra Vista Specific Plan Areas were previously used for livestock grazing, dry land farming, and irrigated crops (City of Roseville 2010, 2011, 2016).

The California Department of Conservation’s Important Farmland classifications—Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance—recognize the land’s suitability for agricultural production by considering the physical and chemical characteristics of the soil, such as soil temperature range, depth of the groundwater table, flooding potential, rock fragment content, and rooting depth. The classifications also consider location, growing season, and moisture available to sustain high-yield crops. Together, Important Farmland and Grazing Land are defined by the California Department of Conservation as “Agricultural Land” (California Public Resources Code, Sections 21060.1 and 21095).

According to the Placer County Important Farmland map, published by the California Department of Conservation’s Division of Land Resource Protection, the majority of the Planning Area is designated as Farmland of Local Importance, Grazing Land, Other Land, and Urban and Built-Up Land (California Department of Conservation 2016). Approximately 20 acres of Prime Farmland borders Pleasant Creek within Reason Farms (California Department of Conservation 2016).

The Planning Area is not zoned for agricultural uses (Placer County 2020, City of Roseville 2020). No parcels within the Planning Area are under Williamson Act contracts (Placer County 2020).

4.1.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

4.1.3.1 FEDERAL

There are no relevant federal policies, regulations, or laws related to land use planning.

4.1.3.2 STATE

State Planning and Zoning Laws

California Government Code Section 65300 et seq. establishes the obligation of cities and counties to adopt and implement general plans. The general plan is a comprehensive, long-term, and general document that describes plans for the physical development of a city or county and of any land outside its boundaries that, in the city’s or county’s judgment, bears relation to its planning. The general plan addresses a broad range of topics, including, at a minimum, land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. In addressing these topics, the general plan identifies the goals, objectives, policies, principles, standards, and plan proposals that support the city’s or county’s vision. The general plan is a long-range document required to address physical development and conservation over a 20-year or longer period. Although the general plan serves as a blueprint for future development and identifies the overall vision for a community’s planning area, it remains general enough to allow for flexibility in the approach taken to achieve the plan’s goals.

Zoning ordinances, which define allowable land uses within a specific zone district, are required to be consistent with the applicable general plan and any applicable specific plans. When amendments to the general plan are
made, corresponding changes in the zoning ordinance may be required within a reasonable time to ensure that the land uses designated in the general plan would also be allowable by the zoning ordinance (California Government Code Section 65860[c]).

A specific plan is a planning tool used to guide land use change, conservation, and public facilities and infrastructure improvements for a subarea of a general plan. Specific plans must be consistent with the overarching general plan (California Government Code, Section 65450). Specific plans describe the distribution, location, and extent of the land uses and the associated infrastructure, as well as standards governing future development. Specific plans must include a statement of the relationship between it and the general plan (California Government Code, Section 65451, subd. [b]).

California Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act

The California Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (Senate Bill [SB] 375) requires regional planning agencies to develop regional land use plans (sustainable communities strategies) to meet greenhouse gas emission reduction goals set forth in the California Global Warming Solutions Act (Assembly Bill 32). These plans address reducing vehicle miles traveled by co-locating uses to shorten necessary trips and by coordinating land use and transportation/transit planning. Coordination is enforced by requiring transportation planning projects to comply with the sustainable community standards to receive state funding. SB 375 also allows projects that meet regional sustainable community standards to qualify for California Environmental Quality Act exemptions or streamlining.

Local Agency Formation Commissions

The Cortese-Knox Local Government Reorganization Act (sec. 56000 et. seq. of the Government Code) is the framework within which proposed city annexations are considered. This law sets forth the functions for a Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), which are agencies that were created by state legislation to ensure that changes in local governmental organization occur in a manner that provides efficient and good-quality services and preserves open space land resources. In 1963, the California Legislature established LAFCOs in each county and gave them regulatory authority over local agency boundary changes. In the 1970s, the legislature recognized the connection between decisions concerning governmental organization and the issues of urban sprawl and loss of prime agricultural land. In response to these concerns, LAFCOs were charged with implementing changes in governmental organization in a manner that preserves agricultural and open space land resources, as well as provides the delivery of services. In 2000, the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act was further amended as a result of Assembly Bill 2838.

The general policies of LAFCOs include:

► encourage planned, well-ordered, efficient urban development patterns;

► encourage the logical formation and determination of boundaries;

► ensure that affected populations receive efficient governmental services; and

► guide development away from open space and prime agricultural land uses unless such actions would not promote planned orderly and efficient development.
Placer County LAFCO oversees the establishment or revision of boundaries for local municipalities and independent special districts for Placer County (see discussion below under “Regional and Local”).

**California Important Farmland Inventory System and Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program**

The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) was established by the State of California in 1982 to continue the Important Farmland mapping efforts begun in 1975 by the Soil Conservation Service (now Natural Resources Conservation Service). The California Department of Conservation implements the FMMP and establishes agricultural easements in accordance with California Public Resources Code Sections 10250–10255.

The California Department of Conservation FMMP maps are updated every two years using aerial photographs, a computer mapping system, public review, and field reconnaissance. The following list describes the categories mapped by the California Department of Conservation:

- **Prime Farmland**—Land that has the best combination of features for the production of agricultural crops.
- **Farmland of Statewide Importance**—Land other than Prime Farmland that has a good combination of physical and chemical features for the production of agricultural crops.
- **Unique Farmland**—Land of lesser quality soils used for the production of the state’s leading agricultural cash crops.
- **Farmland of Local Importance**—Land that is of importance to the local agricultural economy. For Placer County, this includes lands zoned for agriculture by County Ordinance; dry farmed lands, irrigated pasture lands, and other agricultural lands of significant economic importance to the County; and lands that have a potential for irrigation from Placer County water supplies.
- **Grazing Land**—Land with existing vegetation that is suitable for grazing.
- **Urban and Built-up Lands**—Land occupied by structures with a density of at least one dwelling unit per 1.5 acres.
- **Land Committed to Nonagricultural Use**—Vacant areas; existing lands that have a permanent commitment to development but have an existing land use of agricultural or grazing lands.
- **Other Lands**—Land that does not meet the criteria of the remaining categories.

Important Farmland is classified by the California Department of Conservation as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance. Under CEQA, the designations for Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland are defined as “agricultural land” or “farmland” (Public Resources Code Sections 21060.1 and 21095; CEQA Guidelines Appendix G).
Sacramento Area Council of Governments 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

On November 19, 2019, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) approved the 2020 Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (2020 MTP/SCS), which is a regional transportation plan and land use strategy designed to support good growth patterns, including:

► Increased housing and transportation options;
► Inwardly focused growth and improved economic viability of rural areas;
► Minimized direct and indirect transportation impacts on the environment;
► A transportation system that delivers cost-effective results and is feasible to construct and maintain;
► Effective connections between people and jobs;
► Improved opportunities for businesses and citizens to easily access goods, jobs, services, and housing; and
► Real, viable choices for methods of travel.

The 2020 MTP/SCS includes a land use strategy to improve mobility and reduce travel demand from passenger vehicles by prioritizing compact and transit-oriented development, reducing the growth in vehicle miles traveled and associated greenhouse gas emissions. The 2020 MTP/SCS also includes projections for the location of growth within the region, between jurisdictions and among housing place types (i.e., infill and greenfield development).

In the 2020 MTP/SCS, SACOG categorized the urbanized land within its jurisdiction into four Community Types according to land use and density/intensity. According to the 2020 MTP/SCS, three Community Types are represented in Roseville, as follows:

► **Center and Corridor Communities.** Land uses are typically higher density and more mixed than surrounding land uses. These areas are identified in local plans as historic downtowns, main streets, commercial corridors, rail station areas, central business districts, town centers, or other high-density destinations. They typically have more compact development patterns, a greater mix of uses, and a wider variety of transportation infrastructure compared to the rest of the region. In Roseville, this Community Type designation is applied to Downtown Roseville around the Roseville Intermodal Station and along Douglas Boulevard.

► **Developing Communities.** These areas are 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. Areas 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. Transportation options in Developing Communities often depend, to a great extent, on the timing of development. In Roseville, this Community Type designation is applied to the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan, Creekview Specific Plan, and Sierra Ranch Specific Plan areas.

---

1 The fourth Community Type, which is not represented in Roseville, is Rural Residential. Rural Residential communities are typically located outside of urbanized areas and are predominately very low-density residential, with some small-scale hobby or commercial farming.
Established Communities. Typically, these areas are adjacent to, or surrounding, Center and Corridor Communities. Local land use plans aim to maintain the existing character and land use pattern. Land uses are typically made up of existing low- to medium-density residential neighborhoods, office and industrial parks, or commercial strip centers. This Community Type represents all areas of Roseville outside those noted in the Community Types above.

In addition, the area corresponding to the Downtown Specific Plan Area north of the Union Pacific Railroad tracks in the vicinity of the Roseville Intermodal Station is also within a Transit Priority Area, which is defined as an area of the region within 0.5 mile of a major transit stop (existing or planned light rail, street car, or train station) or an existing or planned high-quality transit corridor included in the 2020 MTP/SCS.

SACOG Region Blueprint

The Sacramento Blueprint is a smart growth vision for the Sacramento region that was adopted by the SACOG Board of Directors in December 2004. The SACOG Preferred Blueprint Scenario, referred to as the Blueprint, is a voluntary framework for regional transportation and land use planning that was developed to aid the jurisdictions in the six-county greater Sacramento area in guiding development through 2050.

The Blueprint is intended to suggest different development patterns and density in the future compared to past trends in part to provide for more efficient public facilities and infrastructure, to reduce vehicle miles traveled regionally, to reduce air pollutant emissions, and reduce other environmental impacts. The Blueprint Principles focus on high-quality design for compact development that provides walkable communities; compact development that helps preserve open space, allows multi-modal transportation access, and facilitates more efficient infrastructure provision; reinvestment to allow better use of existing infrastructure; mixed-use development that provides for more vibrant neighborhoods; and open space that is incorporated into development and conserved on the fringes of the developed region for agriculture and habitat. These Blueprint Principles are broad, and are expected to have different application in different parts of the Sacramento region.

Placer County Local Area Formation Commission

The Placer County LAFCO is responsible for reviewing, approving, or disapproving changes in organization to cities and special districts, including annexations, detachments, new formations, and incorporations. LAFCOs must, by law, create municipal-service reviews and update spheres of influence for each independent local governmental jurisdiction within their Countywide jurisdiction. The most recent municipal service review for Roseville was prepared in 2017.

Existing City of Roseville General Plan Policies

The existing Roseville General Plan (City of Roseville 2016) includes the following goals and policies related to land use planning.

Community Form Goal 1: Roseville will strive to be a balanced community with a reasonable mix of land uses, housing types and job opportunities.

Community Form – General Policy 1: Ensure high quality development in new and existing development areas as defined through specific plans, the development review process and community design guidelines.
► **Community Form – General Policy 5**: Promote land use patterns that result in the efficient use of urban lands and preservation of open space as specified in the Open Space and Conservation Element.

► **Community Form – General Policy 6**: Through development approvals and City programs (e.g., revitalization, capital improvement program, parks and recreation programs, etc.) assure that all portions of the community are linked and integrated.

► **Community Form – Relationship to Transit, Pedestrian, Air Quality Policy 1**: Promote land use patterns that support a variety of transportation modes and accommodate pedestrian mobility.

► **Community Form – Relationship to Transit, Pedestrian, Air Quality Policy 2**: Allow for land use patterns and mixed use development that integrate residential and non-residential land uses, such that residents may easily walk or bike to shopping, services, employment and leisure activities.

► **Community Form – Relationship to Transit, Pedestrian, Air Quality Policy 3**: Concentrate higher intensity uses and appropriate support uses within close proximity of transit and bikeway corridors as identified in the Bicycle Master Plan. In addition, some component of public use such as parks, plazas, public buildings, community centers and/or libraries should be located within the corridors.

► **Community Form – Relationship to Transit, Pedestrian, Air Quality Policy 4**: Promote and encourage the location of employee services such as childcare, restaurants, banking facilities, convenience markets, etc., within major employment centers for the purpose of reducing midday service-related vehicle trips.

► **Community Form – Relationship to Transit, Pedestrian, Air Quality Policy 5**: Where feasible, improve existing development areas to create better pedestrian and transit accessibility.

► **Community Form – Relationship to Transit, Pedestrian, Air Quality Policy 6**: Through City land use planning and development approvals, require that neighborhood serving uses (e.g. neighborhood commercial uses, day care, parks, schools, and other community facilities) be physically linked with adjacent residential neighborhoods.

► **Community Form – Relationship of New Development Policy 1**: Require that new development areas and associated community-wide facilities (open space resources, parks, libraries, etc.) be linked and oriented to existing developed areas of the community through road networks, public transit systems, open space systems, bikeway and pedestrian systems, and other physical connections.

► **Community Form – Jobs/Housing and Economic Development Policy 1**: Strive for a land use mix and pattern of development that provides linkages between jobs and employment uses, will provide a reasonable jobs/housing balance, and will maintain the fiscal viability of the City.

**Growth Management Goal 1**: The City shall proactively manage and plan for growth.

**Growth Management Goal 3**: Growth shall mitigate its impacts through consistency with the General Plan goals and polices and shall provide a positive benefit to the community.

**Growth Management Goal 4**: The City shall continue a comprehensive, logical planning process, rather than an incremental, piecemeal approach.
Growth Management Goal 10: Growth should be planned in a way that addresses the appropriate interface between City and County lands.

Growth Management Goal 11: New growth should be designed to meet the Guiding Principles.

- **Growth Management – General Policy 3:** The City shall encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with existing developed areas of the City.

- **Growth Management – General Policy 6:** The City shall use the specific plan process to ensure a comprehensive, logical growth process for new development areas (e.g., annexations) or any areas where significant land use changes are considered.

- **Growth Management – General Policy 10:** Work aggressively to address traffic generated outside of Roseville by working in collaboration with neighboring jurisdictions, regional, state, and federal entities to ensure traffic through Roseville is mitigated by regional solutions. Ensure that transportation solutions are supported by land-use and design policies that promote walking, biking, and transit, consistent with the Growth Management Visioning Committee’s Vision Statement.

- **Growth Management – Annexations and Sphere of Influence Policy 2:** The City may consider annexations that:
  
  a. Are contiguous with City boundaries and provide for a logical expansion of the City;
  b. Create clear and reasonable boundaries;
  c. Are beneficial from a fiscal standpoint to the City and its residents;
  d. Are consistent with State Law and Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) standards and criteria;
  e. Ensure the preservation of open space and agriculture lands; and
  f. Are consistent with the General Plan.

- **Growth Management – Annexations and Sphere of Influence Policy 3:** The City may consider expanding its sphere of influence to incorporate areas that, in the future, should be logically planned and serviced by Roseville. The City shall consider the following factors, as identified by LAFCO, when making determinations involving sphere of influence boundaries:
  
  a. Present and planned land uses in the area;
  b. Present and probable need for public facilities and services in the area;
  c. Present capacity of public facilities and adequacy of public services;
  d. Existence of any social or economic communities of interest in the area; and
  e. Open space and agricultural lands.

- **Growth Management – Growth Areas Policy 3:** The City shall require the submittal of a specific plan for the consideration of new development areas or any areas where a significant modification to the General Plan land use allocation is proposed. The specific plan process shall, at a minimum, include the following:
  
  a. General Plan Amendment
  b. Development Agreement
c. Zoning Entitlements  
d. Environmental Impact Report  
e. Phasing, Financing, Capital Improvements Plan  
f. Fiscal Impact Analysis

► **Growth Management – Growth Areas Policy 4:** Specific plans will be evaluated based on the following minimum criteria:

a. Government Code requirements for specific plans  
b. Demonstrated consistency with General Plan goals and policies  
c. Demonstrated consistency with the identified City-wide studies and holding capacity analysis  
d. Justification for proposed specific plan boundaries  
e. Community benefit  
f. Ability to mitigate impacts  
g. Impact on the City’s growth pattern

Each specific plan proposal shall include, with its initial submittal, a full analysis of how the plan complies with and relates to the above factors. The specific plans’ 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.

► **Growth Management – Growth Areas Policy 6:** As new development is proposed in or outside the City’s Sphere of Influence, project proponents shall provide a transitional area between City and County lands, through a system of interconnecting Open Space land areas or other buffers, such as separation by arterial roadways.

► **Growth Management – Growth Areas Policy 8:** New development proposals to the west of Fiddyment Road within the County/City Memorandum of Understanding Transition Area shall meet the objectives and terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Roseville and the County of Placer.

► **Growth Management – Growth Areas Policy 9:** Development proposed on the western edge of the City shall provide a distinctive open space transition to create a physical and visual buffer between the City and County to assure that the identity and uniqueness of the City and County will be maintained.

► **Circulation – Transit Policy 1:** Pursue and support transit services within the community and region and pursue land use, design and other mechanisms that promote the use of such services.

► **Circulation – Transit Policy 2:** Pursue all available sources of funding for sustainable transit services.

► **Circulation – Transit Policy 3:** Continue to study options for introducing Bus Rapid Transit or extending light rail service to Roseville.

► **Circulation – Transit Policy 4:** Support and remain actively involved in planning for the expansion of Capitol Corridor rail service, as well as other regional linkages.

► **Transportation Systems Management Policy 1:** Continue to enforce the City's TSM ordinance and monitor its effectiveness.
Transportation Systems Management Policy 2: Work with appropriate agencies to develop measures to reduce vehicular travel demand and total vehicle miles traveled and meet air quality goals.

Specific Plans

Roseville has 14 Specific Plan Areas (Exhibit 4.1-1). Under State law, specific plans are required to be consistent with the community’s General Plan. The Specific Plans establish detailed policies and implementation programs for portions of the City, consistent with the goals and policies established in the proposed General Plan Update. Specific Plan land use designations are shown on the General Plan Land Use Map, but Specific Plans may use new land use categories, as well, that are more specific or tailored to a particular situation. Most commonly, these are the City’s mixed-use land use designations, such as Commercial Mixed Use, which is subordinate to the City’s Community Commercial land use designation. The City’s Specific Plans are consistent with the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The proposed General Plan Update assumes development consistent with the following adopted Specific Plans:

- **Southeast Roseville Specific Plan (1985)** – This mixed-use Specific Plan represents the City’s first effort to use the specific plan process to master plan a new development area.
- **Northeast Roseville Specific Plan (1987)** – This Specific Plan is primarily intended for commercial and employment-generating uses but also has significant residential and open space components.
- **Northwest Roseville Specific Plan Area (1989)** – The predominant land uses in this Specific Plan Area are single- and multi-family development, but the Specific Plan also provides for commercial, office, open space, and public uses.
- **North Central Roseville Specific Plan (1990)** – This Specific Plan Area includes residential, commercial, and office uses, along with a large area for wetland preservation and creation.
- **Del Webb Specific Plan (1993)** – This Specific Plan Area is planned as an age-restricted community consisting of single-family homes focused around recreational facilities with supportive private and public uses.
- **Highland Reserve North Specific Plan (1997)** – This Specific Plan accommodates single- and multi-family residential development, along with commercial and other supportive uses.
- **North Roseville Specific Plan (1997)** – This multi-phase Specific Plan includes single- and multi-family dwelling units, commercial uses, parks and other public facilities, and open space.
- **Stoneridge Specific Plan (1998)** – This Specific Plan accommodates single- and multi-family residential development, commercial and office uses, parks and other public facilities, and open space.
- **West Roseville Specific Plan (2004)** – This Specific Plan accommodates single- and multi-family dwelling units, including age-restricted units, commercial uses, industrial development, parks and other public facilities, and open space.
- **Riverside Gateway Specific Plan (2006)** – The Riverside Gateway Specific Plan is intended to guide public improvements and facilitate commercial and residential infill development between Douglas Boulevard and Darling Way.

- **Downtown Specific Plan (2009)** – This Specific Plan encourages mixed-use infill development throughout the Historic Old Town and the Vernon Street District. The associated Downtown Code implements the Plan, physically applying the Plan’s guidance to properties within the Plan Area.

- **Sierra Vista Specific Plan (2010)** – This Specific Plan accommodates single- and multi-family units, including age-restricted units, commercial development, parks and other public facilities, and open space.

- **Creekview Specific Plan (2012)** – This Specific Plan accommodates single- and multi-family dwelling units, commercial and office development, parks and other public facilities, and open space.

- **Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan (2016)** – This Specific Plan accommodates single- and multi-family dwelling units, commercial development, parks and other public facilities, and open space.

**City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance (Title 19 of the Roseville Municipal Code)**

Roseville’s Zoning Ordinance (Title 19 of the Roseville Municipal Code) is the key regulatory tool meant to implement the General Plan, specifically the Land Use Element. The purpose of the ordinance is to protect and promote the public health, safety, and welfare of the City and to provide the economic and social advantages which result from an orderly, planned use of the environment. The Zoning Ordinance establishes specific, enforceable standards with which development must comply such as minimum lot size, maximum building height, minimum building setback, and a list of allowable uses. Zoning applies parcel-by-parcel basis, whereas the General Plan has a community-wide perspective.

**City of Roseville/Placer County Memorandum of Understanding**

In 2000, the City and County entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) to promote interagency communication and foster cooperative land use planning. Recognizing that future development was likely to occur, the MOU established a transition area (MOU Transition Area) that covers approximately 5,527 acres of land area adjacent to the City’s western boundary. In this area, any proposed development must be reviewed by both the City and County and meet certain standards to mitigate any development-related impacts.

The MOU states that, regardless of whether the County or the City processes an application for development within the MOU area, environmental review must be conducted and “all identified Fiscal, Transportation and Circulation, Utilities and Services, Affordable Housing, and Groundwater impacts of proposed development will be mitigated to a level that is less than significant, unless both the County and the City agree that specific over-riding considerations render such mitigation measures infeasible.” In addition, the MOU states that “to the greatest extent practically and legally feasible, the City and County will process development applications in the Transition Area such that development proceeds in an orderly east-to-west progression.”
4.1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

4.1.4.1 METHODOLOGY

The proposed General Plan Update does not include any changes to land use designations, expansion of the City’s Planning Area, or other major physical changes to areas planned for development compared to the existing General Plan, but does include changes to goals, policies, and implementation measures, the impact of which are analyzed as a part of this EIR. This EIR analyzes buildout of the Planning Area consistent with the existing General Plan land use designations compared to existing conditions, which constitute the baseline physical conditions for determining whether potential impacts are significant. In addition, this analysis compares the proposed General Plan Update to land use plans, policies, and regulations with a focus on inconsistencies that could result in adverse physical effects under CEQA.

The evaluation of potential impacts on agricultural resources was based on a review of the Department of Conservation Important Farmland map and Williamson Act Contract map for Placer County (Department of Conservation 2016, Placer County 2020). Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines focuses the analysis on conversion of agricultural land on Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Unique Farmland; therefore, any conversion of these lands would be considered a significant impact under CEQA.

4.1.4.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, a land use planning and agricultural resources impact is considered significant if the proposed project would:

► Physically divide an established community;

► Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect;

► Convert Important Farmland (i.e., Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency), to nonagricultural use;

► Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract;

► Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use.

4.1.4.3 ISSUES NOT DISCUSSED FURTHER

Conversion of Important Farmland—As discussed previously, approximately 20 acres of Prime Farmland borders Pleasant Creek within Reason Farms. The remainder of the Planning Area is designated by the Placer County Important Farmland map as Farmland of Local Importance, Grazing Land, Other Land, and Urban and Built-Up Land (California Department of Conservation 2016). These designations are not considered Important Farmland under CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21060.1 and 21095 and CEQA Guidelines Appendix G). The areas of Prime Farmland with Reason Farms is not proposed for conversion to urban land uses. Therefore,
The buildout of the General Plan would not convert Important Farmland to nonagricultural uses. No impact would occur.

**Conflict with Agricultural Zoning or a Williamson Act Contract**—The Planning Area is not zoned for agricultural uses and no parcels are under Williamson Act contracts (Placer County 2020). Therefore, buildout of the General Plan would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur.

### 4.1.4.4 Impact Analysis

**IMPACT**

**Physically Divide an Established Community.** Buildout of the existing General Plan would not physically divide an established community. The City’s land use designations and roadway locations were planned comprehensively through the Specific Plan process to provide connected communities. The proposed General Plan Update policies continue to require new development areas and associated community-wide facilities to be linked and oriented to existing developed areas of the community through road networks, public transit systems, open space systems, bikeway and pedestrian systems, and other physical connections and encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with existing developed areas of the City. Policy changes augment the existing language to ensure that transportation options within the City are multi-modal and connect residential areas to supporting land uses such as schools and parks. This impact is considered less than significant.

Buildout of the existing General Plan would not physically divide any of Roseville’s established communities. The type of linear project most likely to have this effect would be a major new road, highway, or similar infrastructure. The City’s land use designations and roadway locations were planned comprehensively through the Specific Plan process to provide connected communities. While buildout of the existing General Plan does include improvements to existing roadways and similar infrastructure, these improvements would not introduce new physical divisions.

As discussed further in Section 4.3, “Transportation,” the Circulation Element of the existing General Plan establishes policies designed to improve mobility and connectivity amongst existing development and new development including a focus on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit mobility. New roadway improvements are mostly in undeveloped areas, such as in the Creekview, Amoruso Ranch, and Sierra Vista Specific Plan Areas, where new infrastructure would not divide existing communities. Furthermore, existing General Plan land use policies, as shown in the Regulatory Framework above, reduce the potential for land use development to physically divide an established community by requiring new development to be linked and oriented to existing developed areas of the community.

The proposed project includes relevant updates to policies within the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The proposed policy updates are shown below in **bold, underlined** text for additions and **strikethrough** text for deletions, followed by an evaluation. The following proposed General Plan Update policies related to the physical division of an established community in Roseville are proposed for revision:

- **Policy LU2.5:** Where feasible, improve existing development areas to create better pedestrian, bicycle, and transit accessibility.
Policy LU2.6: Through City land use planning and development approvals, require proposed that neighborhood-serving uses (e.g., neighborhood commercial uses, day care, parks, schools, and other community facilities and services) to be physically linked with adjacent residential neighborhoods through multi-modal transportation connections.

Policy LU4.1: Require that new development areas and associated community-wide facilities (open space resources, parks, libraries, etc.) to be linked and oriented to existing developed areas of the community through road networks, public transit systems, open space systems, bikeway and pedestrian systems, and other physical connections.

The proposed policy amendments do not have the potential to create development patterns or other actions that would physically divide any established community. On the contrary, the policy changes augment the existing language to ensure that neighborhoods and districts within developing portions of the Planning Area are better connected with one another. Revised policies add to language within the existing General Plan to emphasize that a variety of transportation options will be provided for development within the Planning Area that offer multi-modal connections between residential areas and destination land uses, such as schools and parks. Therefore, proposed General Plan Update policy changes listed above would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

Conclusion

Implementing existing General Plan Community Form – General Policy 6 and Growth Management – General Policy 3 (listed previously in the Regulatory Framework section, and which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policies LU2.5, LU2.6, and LU 4.1 listed above, would require new development areas and associated community-wide facilities to be linked and oriented to existing developed areas of the community through road networks, public transit systems, open space systems, bikeway and pedestrian systems, and other physical connections and encourage a development pattern that is contiguous with existing developed areas of the City. The proposed General Plan Update does not include new investment in infrastructure or development that would physically divide existing communities. Therefore, impacts associated with division of an established community are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

No mitigation is required.

IMPACT 4.1-2 Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation. The proposed General Plan Update was designed to ensure consistency with other relevant plans, programs, and regulations that were developed to reduce or avoid environmental impacts. There are no inconsistencies between the proposed General Plan Update and other plans that would result in a significant environmental impact not already addressed in this EIR. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

The City has analyzed the potential for inconsistencies between the proposed General Plan Update and other relevant plans, policies, or regulations that were adopted to reduce environmental effects. The proposed General Plan Update was designed specifically to reduce environmental impacts of long-term growth within Roseville and to be consistent with relevant plans, policies, and regulations. Applicable plans and policies that are relevant to
lands within the Planning Area are listed below, along with an evaluation of their consistency with the proposed General Plan Update.

**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS 2020 MTP/SCS**

The 2020 MTP/SCS is a regional transportation plan and land use strategy designed to support good growth patterns, including increased housing and transportation options; minimized direct and indirect transportation impacts on the environment; effective connections between people and jobs; improved opportunities for businesses and citizens to easily access goods, jobs, services, and housing; and real, viable choices for methods of travel.

The MTP/SCS is not designed to address full build-out conditions of each jurisdiction’s planning area; it consists of a market-based forecast of growth. Therefore, although the 2020 MTP/SCS and the proposed General Plan Update both have planning horizons of 2035, the 2020 MTP/SCS land use assumptions only include the increment of growth likely to be developed by 2035, while this EIR analysis examines full buildout of the General Plan.

The 2020 MTP/SCS includes a land use strategy to improve mobility and reduce travel demand from passenger vehicles by prioritizing compact and transit-oriented development, reducing the growth in vehicle miles traveled and associated greenhouse gas emissions.

The proposed General Plan Update includes revisions and new policies to both Land Use Element Policies and Circulation Element policies, which are shown below in **bold, underlined** text for additions and strikethrough text for deletions, which are relevant to MTP/SCS consistency:

- **Policy LU2.1:** Promote land use development patterns that support a variety of transportation modes and accommodate pedestrian mobility.

- **Policy LU2.2:** Allow for land use patterns and mixed-use development that integrates residential and non-residential land uses, such that residents may easily walk or bike to shopping, services, employment, and leisure activities.

- **Policy LU2.4:** Promote and encourage the location of employee services, such as child care, restaurants, banking facilities, convenience markets, etc and other daily needs, within major employment centers for the purpose of reducing mid-day service-related vehicle trips.

- **Policy LU2.5:** Where feasible, improve existing development areas to create better pedestrian, bicycle, and transit accessibility.

- **Policy LU5.1:** Roseville will strive to be a balanced complete community with a reasonable mix of land uses, housing types, and job opportunities that meet the diverse needs of its existing and future residents and businesses.

- **Policy LU8.10:** [Growth Management – Public Amenities, Policy 2]: In addition to being consistent with the other goals and policies of the General Plan, specific plans shall comply with the following: [Moved from referenced existing policy]
a. Provide a public focal point, community, and/or theme feature. These features shall be specific to each area and be designed to promote and enhance community character. A special feature may include, but is not limited to, a community plaza, central park, or some other type of gathering area; outdoor amphitheater; community garden; regional park with special facilities; sports complex; or cultural facilities.

b. Provide entryways at entrances to the City in accordance with the Community Design Guidelines. Where possible, the entryways shall take advantage of and incorporate existing natural resources into the entry treatment. The Specific Plans shall identify the location and treatment of the entryways, and shall consider the use of open space, oak regeneration areas, signage, and/or special landscaping to create a visual edge or buffer that provides a strong definition to entryways into the City.

c. The Specific Plans area shall be planned and oriented to be an integral part of the City consistent with the policies of the Community Form component of this Element.

d. Develop design guidelines, specifying screening and a transition between public utilities (e.g. substations, pump stations) and other uses, in conjunction with the public utility departments and agencies. In addition, development along power line and pipeline easements shall incorporate design treatment to ensure compatibility and safety. Design guidelines and treatment may include minimum setbacks, building and landscape design standards, and possible limitations on certain types of uses and activities.

e. Preserve natural resource areas where they exist, and where feasible, along new roadways. Such roadways may create a public boundary between the resource area and other uses. The Specific Plans shall identify locations and standards for the preservation of natural resources along roadways, and shall identify sources of financing for such road segments.

► **Policy CIRC3.1:** Pursue and support transit services within the community and region and pursue land use, design, and other mechanisms that promote the use of such services. Promote transit service that is convenient, cost-effective, and responsive to the challenges and opportunities of serving Roseville and surrounding communities, and explore opportunities for transit innovation and service improvements.

► **Policy CIRC3.3:** Continue to study options for introducing Bus Rapid Transit, high quality transit and/or extending other regional transit linkages to Roseville and developing convenient connections to Sacramento Regional Transit light rail service to Roseville.

► **Policy CIRC4.1:** Continue to enforce the City's TSM ordinance and monitor its effectiveness. The City will review and condition projects, as appropriate, to reduce travel demand per capita and per employee by promoting increased density near transit, improving the quality of non-vehicular transportation options, providing incentives for non-vehicular travel, encouraging the mixing of complementary land uses in proximity to one another, and using other feasible methods.

► **Policy CIRC4.2:** Work with appropriate agencies to develop implementation measures to reduce vehicular travel demand and total vehicle miles traveled and meet air quality goals.

► **Policy CIRC4.3:** Specific Plan Amendments and land use development projects not included in a Specific Plan shall be evaluated for consistency with the City’s VMT Impact Standards.
► **Policy CIRC4.4:** If the evaluation required by CIRC4.3 finds a Specific Plan Amendment or land use development project not included in an adopted Specific Plan is inconsistent with thresholds established within the City’s VMT Impact Standards, on-site land use, transportation, and urban design-related VMT-reducing features should be prioritized to demonstrate consistency. If feasible on-site features cannot achieve the VMT threshold, Specific Plan Amendments and land use development projects outside Specific Plan Areas may demonstrate equivalent consistency through off-site actions or fair-share fee contributions, or if consistency cannot be achieved, shall implement all feasible measures.

► **Policy CIRC5.5:** Specific Plans shall incorporate an off-street, Class I bicycle system as part of the comprehensive on-street and off-street bikeway plan.

► **Policy CIRC6.2:** Promote development patterns that encourage people to walk to destinations.

► **Policy CIRC6.3:** Enhance pedestrian-friendly street environments and design public spaces and destinations in a way that encourages walking.

► **Policy CIRC6.4:** Sidewalks shall be required in all new Specific Plan Areas with new roadway construction and with roadway expansion.

These proposed General Plan Update policy amendments are consistent with the MTP/SCS land use strategies and goals. The proposed policy revisions augment and update the existing General Plan policies, and the new policies address the need to evaluate VMT and support multi-modal transportation options. These changes enhance the consistency of the General Plan with the MTP/SCS and do not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

Existing General Plan land use and circulation policies, as shown in the Regulatory Framework section, are also consistent with the intent of the MTP/SCS to promote efficient land use patterns, support mixed use development, and support multi-modal transportation.

**SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS REGION BLUEPRINT**

In 2005, the City carried out a process to identify how Blueprint Principles should be applied locally, including the Roseville Blueprint Implementation Strategies listed below, which are embodied in the Community Form and Community Design components of the Land Use Element of the General Plan.2 These strategies are consistent with and implement the intent of the Blueprint Principles.

► **Transportation Choices:** Provide a variety of transportation choices. Development should be designed to encourage people to walk, ride bicycles, ride the bus, ride transit and heavy rail, or carpool. Land use concepts are intended to encourage the use of these modes of travel and reduce congestion.

► **Mixed Land Use:** Provide a variety of services in proximity to residential uses to reduce the reliance on automobile travel and give residents transit options. A mix of land uses can be provided within the same building and/or project. There are many examples of this type of development: housing near employment centers; a building with ground-floor retail with housing such as apartments or condominiums above; etc.

---

2 Please see *Smart Choices for Roseville’s Future: Implementation Strategies to Achieve Blueprint Project Objectives* for more details.
► **Compact Development:** Take advantage of compact building design. Creating environments that are more compactly built and that use space in an efficient but aesthetic manner can encourage more walking, biking, and public transit use, and shorten auto trips.

► **Housing Choices:** Create a range of housing opportunities and choices. Providing a variety of places where people can live—apartments, condominiums, townhouses, and single-family detached homes on varying lot sizes—is important in serving all aspects of the community: families, singles, seniors, and people with special needs. This issue is of special concern for the people with very low-, low-, and moderate-incomes, often our teachers, entry-level public safety personnel, and other public employees and professionals, as well as retail employees, service workers, and others for whom finding housing close to work is challenging, especially as land values increase. By providing a mix of housing options, more people have a choice.

► **Use Existing Assets:** Use existing assets to strengthen and direct development toward existing development areas. A key component of the Growth Management Visioning Committee recommendation is ensuring a vibrant downtown. Ongoing public and private investment in the Downtown and historic core is critical to maintaining and enhancing the economic vitality of Roseville. Development of infill or vacant lands, intensification of underutilized parcels, or redevelopment can make better use of existing public infrastructure. This can include rehabilitation and reuse of buildings, introduction of mixed-use opportunities, and joint-use of existing public facilities, such as parking garages.

► **Natural Resource Conservation:** Natural resource conservation of open space and agricultural land. Encourage the incorporation of public-use open space (such as parks, town squares, trails, greenbelts, paseos, and preserves) within development projects and protect wildlife and plant habitat through open space preservation, agricultural preservation, and promotion of environment-friendly practices, such as energy efficient design, water conservation, and stormwater management. In addition to conserving resources and protecting species, natural resource conservation improves the overall quality of life by providing places for everyone to enjoy the outdoors with family outings and by creating a sense of open space throughout the community.

► **Quality Design:** Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place and use land efficiently. 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 right-of-way (sidewalks, connected streets and paths, bike lanes, and the width of streets) are all factors that can influence the attractiveness of living in a compact development. Design also facilitates the ease of walking and biking to work or neighborhood services. Good site and architectural design are important factors in creating a sense of community and a sense of place.

**Placer County Local Agency Formation Commission**

Placer County LAFCO is responsible for determining whether an annexation is consistent with the LAFCO objectives and policies of ensuring that services would be available to new development within proposed annexation areas; avoiding premature conversion of farmland; and ensuring planned, logical, and orderly patterns of urban growth.

The City’s Planning Area does not extend beyond the current Sphere of Influence and the proposed General Plan Update does not include any expansion of the City’s Sphere of Influence. Therefore, the proposed General Plan
Update is consistent with LAFCO objectives and policies. Future annexation of lands within Roseville’s Sphere of Influence into the City’s jurisdiction would need to be approved by Placer County LAFCO. The City is required to coordinate with LAFCO during the annexation process to ensure that municipal services are provided to newly annexed areas. The existing General Plan growth management policies, as shown in the Regulatory Framework section, would further ensure consistency with Placer County LAFCO policies for any future annexations. The project does not include any changes to the relevant growth management policies contained in the existing General Plan that could have any adverse environmental effects.

**SPECIFIC PLANS**

As described in Section 4.1.3 above, there are 14 Specific Plan Areas in the City. Specific plans are required to be consistent with the General Plan. If there are new Specific Plans proposed in the future, or proposed amendments to existing Specific Plans, the City would review and revise these documents, where necessary, to ensure consistency with the proposed General Plan Update. According to State Government Code 65359, “any specific plan or other plan of the city or county that is applicable to the same areas or matters affected by a general plan amendment shall be reviewed and amended as necessary to make the specific or other plan consistent with the general plan.”

The existing General Plan includes policies to ensure consistency between the General Plan and new specific plans, as shown in the Regulatory Framework section. The proposed General Plan Update includes minor amendments to both of these policies, which are shown below in **bold, underlined** text for additions and **strikethrough** text for deletions:

- **Policy LU9.3:** The City shall require the submittal of a specific plan for the consideration of new development areas or any areas where a significant modification to the General Plan land use allocation is proposed. The specific plan process shall, at a minimum, include the following:
  
  a. General Plan Amendment
  b. Development Agreement
  c. Zoning Entitlements
  d. Environmental Impact Report
  e. Phasing, Financing, Capital Improvements Plan
  f. Fiscal Impact Analysis
  g. Tax Share Agreement
  h. Municipal Services Review

- **Policy LU9.4:** Specific plans will be evaluated based on the following minimum criteria:
  
  a. Government Code requirements for specific plans
  b. Demonstrated consistency with General Plan goals and policies
  c. Demonstrated consistency with the identified City-wide studies and holding capacity analyses
  d. Justification for proposed specific plan boundaries
c. Community benefit (e.g., affordable housing, significant open space or recreation facilities, job creation, infill development near transit service).

d. Ability to substantially mitigate impacts

e. 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 plans’ 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.

The proposed General Plan Update policy amendments provide additional clarity and supporting language. Specific Plans do not always involve annexation, and therefore do not always require tax share agreements or a Municipal Services Review. Accordingly, those items are proposed for removal from the list of minimum requirements. The changes to Policy LU9.4 provide additional supporting language for the list of minimum evaluation criteria, and remove the duplicative final statement. The proposed General Plan Update is consistent with the City’s Specific Plan process, and would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE ZONING ORDINANCE

The City’s Zoning Ordinance describes the permitted land uses and development standards for each of the designated zoning districts in the City on a parcel-by-parcel basis. The Zoning Code must be consistent with and is subordinate to the General Plan. The proposed General Plan Update does not include any modifications that would require revision of the City of Roseville Zoning Ordinance.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE/PLACER COUNTY MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

The City of Roseville/Placer County MOU promotes interagency communication and fosters cooperative land use planning. The MOU established a transition area (adjacent to the City’s western boundary) in which any proposed development must be reviewed by both the City and County and meet certain standards to mitigate any development-related impacts.

The existing General Plan includes policies to ensure compliance with the City/County MOU, as shown in the Regulatory Framework section. The proposed General Plan Update includes minor revisions to ensure compliance with the City/County MOU, which are shown in bold, underlined text for additions and strikethrough text for deletions below:

► **Policy LU9.6:** As new development is proposed in or outside the City’s Sphere of Influence, project proponents shall provide a transitional area between City and County lands, through a system of managed interconnecting open space land areas or other buffers, such as separation by arterial roadways.

► **Policy LU9.8:** New development proposals to the north and west of the City limits within Fiddyment Road within the County/City Memorandum of Understanding Transition Area shall meet the objectives and terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Roseville and the County of Placer.
Policy LU9.9: Development proposed on the western edge of the City shall provide a distinctive open space transition to create a physical and visual buffer between the City and County to assure that ensures that the identity and uniqueness of the City and County will be maintained.

The proposed revisions reword the existing policies for clarity, but do not change the intent. The proposed General Plan Update is consistent with the City of Roseville/Placer County MOU, and includes policies that implement and support the MOU and would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

Conclusion

Implementing existing General Plan Circulation – Transit Policies 2 and 4 (listed previously in the Regulatory Framework section, and which have been renumbered for the proposed General Plan Update), as well as revised proposed General Plan Update Policies LU2.1, LU2.2, LU2.4, LU2.6, LU8.10, LU9.3, LU9.4, LU9.6, LU9.8, LU9.9, CIRC3.1, CIRC3.3, CIRC4.1, CIRC4.2, CIRC4.3, CIRC4.4, CIRC5.5, CIRC6.2, CIRC6.2 and CIRC6.4 listed above, would enhance the consistency of the General Plan with the MTP/SCS, promote clarity in policies related to specific plans, and support the City of Roseville/Placer County MOU related to land use planning in the City’s Sphere of Influence. As illustrated above, the proposed General Plan Update was drafted to ensure consistency with other relevant plans, programs, and regulations that were developed to reduce or avoid environmental impacts. There are no inconsistencies between the proposed General Plan Update and other plans that would result in a significant environmental impact not already addressed in this EIR. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

No mitigation is required.

Impact

Conflict with Existing Agricultural Operations. Buildout of the General Plan would locate urban land uses adjacent to existing grazing lands along the northwestern, western, and southern boundaries outside of the Planning Area. Consistent with the City’s General Plan policy to provide separation between City and County uses, development would be set back from on-going grazing activities and a physical separation would be provided by open space, road rights-of-way, fences, and walls. No long-term conflicts with grazing lands would occur as future approved urban development occurs in unincorporated Placer County. Therefore, buildout of the General Plan would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of grazing lands. This impact is considered less than significant.

Buildout of the General Plan would locate urban land uses adjacent to existing grazing lands along the northwestern, western, and southern boundaries outside of the Planning Area, resulting in potential conflicts with adjacent grazing operations. The northern and western portions of Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Area are adjacent to grazing land in unincorporated Placer County, including the Gleason cattle ranch to the west, Toad Hill Mitigation Bank to the northwest, grazing land to the east, and Reason Farms to the west within the City limits. The southern and western portions of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area would be adjacent to grazing lands in unincorporated Placer County. Future development within the Amoruso Ranch, West Roseville, and Sierra Vista Specific Plan Areas would result in urban development adjacent to these grazing lands.
It is expected that cattle grazing would continue to occur as the primary agricultural activity on adjacent lands, and it is not expected that heavy agricultural uses, such as growing row crops, would be conducted (City of Roseville 2010, 2016). Grazing activities can produce dust, noise, and odor at levels that can cause a nuisance when close to residential areas. At the same time, the increase in population in the area could disturb agricultural activities or result in harassment of cattle if pedestrians trespass onto adjacent lands. Conflicts between proposed urban development with adjacent grazing activities were addressed in the West Roseville Specific Plan EIR, Sierra Vista Specific Plan EIR, and the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan EIR and the environmental impacts of locating urban development adjacent to grazing lands were analyzed in those CEQA documents (City of Roseville 2004, 2010, 2016). Future development on the City/County boundary would be separated by open space/buffers and/or road rights-of-way. Any residential uses would be set back from grazing lands and separation would be created by design features, such as fences or walls (City of Roseville 2004, 2010, 2016). Future land use plans would be subject to project-level CEQA analysis and mitigation, if necessary, to ensure urban development does not conflict with on-going grazing operations. In addition, to reduce potential conflicts between sensitive uses and agricultural uses, previously adopted mitigation measures associated with the Specific Plans require all future occupants of properties adjacent to the County to be provided with a deed disclosure or similar notice regarding the proximity and nature of neighboring potential agricultural uses (City of Roseville 2004, 2010, 2016).

Placer County has approved urban development along the northern, western, and southern boundaries of the Planning Area. The Placer Vineyard Specific Plan Area is south of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan Area, south of Baseline Road; and the Curry Creek Community Plan Area is west of the Sierra Vista Specific Plan and West Roseville Specific Plan Areas, north of Baseline Road and south of Philip Road; and the Placer Ranch Specific Plan shares a three-mile boundary with the City, from the eastern Boundary of the Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan to just east of Woodcreek Oaks Boulevard. Therefore, no long-term conflicts with grazing lands would occur as approved urban development occurs in unincorporated Placer County. In addition, Reason Farms, located in the northwestern corner of the Planning Area, is proposed as a major stormwater retention facility and future open space recreation area.

The following proposed General Plan Update goals and policies related to agricultural activities are proposed for revision:

► **Policy LU9.6:** As new development is proposed in or outside the City’s Sphere of Influence, project proponents shall provide a transitional area between City and County lands, through a system of managed interconnecting Open Space land areas, open space or other buffers, such as separation by arterial roadways.

The proposed General Plan Update policy changes listed above are for clarity only, and would not result in any adverse environmental impacts.

**Conclusion**

Consistent with the City’s proposed General Plan Update Policy LU9.6 listed above to provide separation between City and County uses, development in the Sierra Vista Specific Plan, West Roseville Specific Plan, and Amoruso Ranch Specific Plan Areas would be set back from on-going grazing activities and a physical separation would be provided by open space, buffers, road rights-of-way, fences, and walls. In addition, future occupants of the Specific Plan Areas would be provided with a deed disclosure or similar notice regarding the proximity and nature of neighboring potential agricultural uses. Placer County has approved urban development adjacent to these Specific Plan Areas. Therefore, no long-term conflicts with grazing lands would occur as urban
development occurs in unincorporated Placer County. In addition, Reason Farms, located in the northwestern corner of the Planning Area, is proposed as a major stormwater retention facility and future open space recreation area. Therefore, buildout of the General Plan would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of grazing lands. This impact is considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure**

No mitigation is required.