

## **General Plan Update Information Responses to Recent Questions**

---

### **Did the City's consultant recommend 4,000 new homes over the next 20 years?**

In the Economic and Fiscal Background Report (April 29, 2013) prepared for the General Plan Update effort by BAE, there is a discussion of the SACOG growth projections (p. 21). For the City of Woodland, SACOG projects demand for about 1,000 new units between 2014 and 2020, and about 2,900 additional units between 2020 and 2035, for a total of 4,000 units. This was not independent new analysis; this was a summary of the regional forecast developed by the metropolitan planning organization. This background economic report provided a summary of existing analysis and economic information.

The Staff Report prepared for October 15, 2013 provided additional analysis of various projection methodologies. Upon review of all options, staff recommended ignoring the lows and highs, and suggested that a possible reasonable residential demand would be 5,500 units through 2035.

### **Does a growth rate of 1.7% translate to 10,000 new homes over the next 20 years?**

The average 1.7% annual growth rate, over 22 years (2014 through 2035), would equate to approximately 8,963 added units. Woodland's current population (1/1/13) is 56,908 and we have 19,964 dwelling units. Assuming an annual 1.7 percent population growth rate and 2.85 persons per housing unit) the 2035 population would be 82,458 and there would be 28,927 dwelling units.

### **Did any individual propose actually propose 10,000 new homes on October 15, 2013?**

The number 10,559 appears in Table 1 on page 2 of a memorandum from the firm Development Planning and Financing Group (DPFG) to Tim Taron of Hefner Stark and Marois (Attached to the staff report provided on October 15, 2013). The number was identified as the number of new housing units in 2035 based on 1.7 percent population growth over a 27 year period starting in 2008 through 2035, assuming 2.75 persons per household. However, as identified above, if applied for the 22-year period from 2014 through 2035 a 1.7 percent rate would equate to approximately 8,963 units by 2035.

### **Does a growth rate of 1.7 percent translate to an increase of Woodland's population to 84,000 over the next 20 years?**

Population estimates will vary based on the assumptions used. You will get a different estimate if you use persons per household verses persons per housing unit, and if you use varying periods of time for the estimate. Using a the assumptions noted above for the 22-year period from 2014 through 2035, 1.7 percent population growth rate and a persons per housing unit factor of 2.85, results in a 2035 population number of 82,458.

### **Must infrastructure be sized to accommodate maximum growth? If so, who bears the cost? Do the existing citizens bear some of those costs or are they borne by the developers?**

State law requires consistency throughout a general plan, including between elements such as land use, circulation, and public facilities and services. In that regard, infrastructure and facilities planning must be matched to land use planning. Any services or infrastructure that is deemed necessary based on growth expected to occur within the horizon period must be planned for and funding identified.

In order to match infrastructure with planned development, cities typically develop infrastructure plans to show how development will be served by need infrastructure over time, at required service levels. City's must plan not only for the installation of the new infrastructure and facilities, but the ongoing cost of operation and maintenance. The cost for new infrastructure may be assigned proportionately to those that benefit. To the extent that a given infrastructure improvement is required solely to serve new development, the full cost may be assigned to that development. Often, however, there is some proportion of new infrastructure that also serves existing development and the mechanisms to fund that burden are often difficult to implement.

Once built, the operation and maintenance costs of the facility, employees, and vehicles are paid for by all City users of the facility and services. It is important to determine whether the long term costs of serving development are acceptable. The costs and benefits may vary depending on the location and type of growth and services and facilities needed.

Most general plans contain more developable land than is likely to build out within the plan horizon year based on demand. One way to address long term impacts is through use of phasing and triggers as well as through the use of "holding" land use designations like Urban Reserve or Specific Plan.

Jurisdictions can choose to do detailed infrastructure and land use planning for near-term areas and assign "holding" designations to properties that, for a variety of reasons, are not likely to develop within the identified horizon year of the plan. Cities do not have to mitigate the impacts development of land reserved for future growth in these "holding" designations if later legislative approvals (e.g. general plan amendment and rezoning, with accompanying environmental analysis) are necessary for that land to move forward. However, if precise land use designations are assigned to land areas and/or there is a desire to provide environmental clearance, then it is assumed it will develop within the horizon and mitigation must be provided for impacts. Mitigation could include such items as requiring a new fire station, new police officers, a new interchange, more wells/tanks to meet water demand, etc.

### **When and how did the voters approve a growth rate or cap?**

"City of Woodland General Plan Referendum Measure B" was on the November 5, 1996 Yolo County general election ballot. This measure stated as follows: *Shall Resolution No. 3944, approved by the Woodland City Council on February 27, 1996, entitled "Resolution of the City Council of the City of Woodland Certifying the Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan, Making Findings, and Adopting the General Plan for the City of Woodland," be adopted?* In the "Impartial Analysis by the City Attorney" the following language was used: *...The 1988 General Plan projects population of 60,700 in the year 2010, a growth rate of 2.25% annually. The 1996 General Plan would limit population growth to average 1.7% annually, to 60,000 in 2015 and 66,000 in 2020.*

The approved 1996 General Plan growth policy provided for expansion of the City and new growth to the south and a population of 60,000 by 2015 which equated to a 1.7% growth rate. However, the General Plan did not actually contain any references to a specific growth rate. The actual policy and implementation language is provided below:

#### 1996 General Plan Policy 1.A. 7

*The City shall manage residential growth at an even and reasonable pace, so as not to exceed a population of 60,000 in the year 2015.*

1996 Implementation Program 1.3

*The City shall monitor housing and population growth and regional growth projections and report annually to the CC regarding the need to take any actions so as not to exceed the growth projections of Policy 1.A.7*

The City Council has amended the General Plan multiple times since 1996. These actions did not require voter approval. In particular, the policy from which the 1.7 percent growth rate was derived was modified in May 2005. The City Council adopted Resolution 4636 which modified the relevant policy and implementation action as follows:

2005 Revised Policy 1.A.7

*The City of Woodland shall manage residential growth at an even and reasonable pace so that single family residential construction in new planned residential neighborhoods does not exceed **5,000 houses by the year 2020** per approved Specific Plans. The intent is to limit the number of building permits each year, adjusting for market fluctuations. The intent is not to limit infill and multi-family development, including multi-family development approved in planned neighborhoods.*

2005 Revised Implementation Program 1.3

*The City shall monitor housing growth and regional growth projections and report annually to the City Council regarding the need to take any action on limiting single family construction in new residential neighborhoods so as to not exceed the growth and housing projections of Policy 1.A.7.*

The growth cap policy was amended and restated in 2005 in order tie growth regulation to building units rather than population. Further, clarifying language was added to address multi-family and infill. Single family “infill” development is exempt from the growth cap calculation.

In the Resolution findings for the 2005 amendment, it was stated that a key reason for the clarification in the growth policy was that with the adoption of Spring Lake, a higher population number would be realized (69,719), than allowed under the current growth policy. Spring Lake provided for a total estimated 6,935 new dwelling units, of which approximately 4,800 were assumed to be single family. Further, it was determined that due to variations in household size that population would be a difficult metric to track and regulate.

The new growth policy continued to confirm the decision in the 1996 General Plan to grow to the south, but it added the concept that the growth restriction applied only to new single family in new planned residential neighborhoods. “Planned Neighborhood” was a land use designation used in the 1996 and 2002 General Plan to show future growth areas and was applied over Spring Lake and the Spring Lake Master Planned Remainder Area.