

Commenter	Comment	Response
Bonnie London	Behind Raley's is really the ideal location for affordable housing: close to groceries, schools, services (library), etc.	Thank you for your comment. This is where the Town has identified sites for the bulk of their lower-income RHNA.
Bonnie London	<p>While the town owns Heritage Park, those sites are listed as above moderate in the housing inventory. With the surplus land act, could the town offer a portion of the land to Stonegate for above moderate homes in exchange for true affordable units behind Raley's? Ideally, the sites on Heritage Park which run parallel to the freeway could be designated as park with production and maintenance fees built into the development.</p> <p>It seems like it'd be a win-win solution, generate actual production of affordable units, negate the need to compromise commercial sites with greater economic potential, provide community benefits and much needed park space, and hopefully meet the needs and desires from different town residents who often have competing interests.</p>	This is being considered by the Town, but the actions lie outside the scope of the General Plan.
Bonnie London	If you need assistance getting in touch with an affordable housing nonprofit to see if this is a viable option, I can reach out to Veronica Blake for contacts.	Thank you for this comment/offer. The Town has contacts at several affordable housing providers but will consider this approach. This action lies outside of the scope of the General Plan as the Town has spoken with St. Anton Community Partners, Brilliant Corners, and NC Brown Development regarding the required zoning for affordable development, which is inside the scope of the General Plan.
Bonnie London	<p>YIGBY (affordable housing at church sites). This may be something to consider and approach some of our faith based communities to see if there's any interest.</p> <p>https://www.dailydemocrat.com/2019/06/17/bay-area-churches-building-housing-in-gods-backyard/</p> <p>https://yigby.org/</p> <p>https://ternercenter.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/Mapping_the_Potential_and_Identifying_the_Barriers_to_Faith-Based_Housing_Development_May_2020.pdf</p>	The Town has adequate, appropriately zones sites available to meet the lower-income RHNA, however this approach may provide a way to provide a surplus of affordable housing. This is being considered by the Town and may be included in a program.
Bonnie London	<p>Staff Report: 2nd page, "...the Town must include a program (Program 11) to increase the allowable density from 15 units per acre to 20 units per acre for mixed use projects in the Tourist Commercial land use designation and in the Central Commercial zoning districts."</p> <p>Program 11 is about limited conditions which allow counting existing units toward RHNA so does not address changes in density, Page V-47: Sites Appropriate for Lower Income Housing cites Central Commercial and Town Center Commercial, not Tourist Commercial so wondering if this is an error on the staff report?</p> <p>Programs 9 & 10 address identifying sites for 20 units/acre. Are one of these the Program referred to for increasing density from 15 to 20 units/acre? If so, it's not clear why all mixed use projects in different areas should allow 50% residential, especially in the Tourist Commercial area where the majority of the subcommittee members are not in favor of residential.</p>	<p>The proposed increase in allowable density is on land zoned for Central Commercial and with the Town Center Commercial designation. This has confirmed to be accurate in the Housing Element and will be clarified with the Planning Commission.</p> <p>Program 11 reads: "To ensure the Town has sufficient capacity beyond the required Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), the Town will amend the General Plan Land Use Element to increase the allowable density in the Town's Tourist Commercial (CC) land use designation from 15 units per acre to 20 units per acre and will amend the Zoning Code to increase the allowable density in the Central Commercial zoning district from 15 units per acre to 20 units per acre." Therefore, the reference to this program is accurate. The Programs 9, 10, and 11 that the commenter is referring to is from the "Review of Previous Housing Element" and not of current programs. Please see the current Goals, Policies, and Programs beginning on page V-103 of the Draft 2021-2029 Housing Element.</p> <p>The Housing Committee members expressed support for allowing residential development in commercial areas, as long as it maintains the commercial character, no sites are developed at 100% residential, and traffic concerns are addressed. Currently, the Town does not allow any commercial sites to develop with a fully residential project and limits residential density. The Town currently prohibits residential uses on the first floor of a mixed-use project in the Central Commercial zone district to maintain the retail frontage. Please refer to Section 13.42.140 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding mixed-use project</p>
Bonnie London	<p>The town's projection of 3 [ADU's] per year and 24 for the 8 year cycle is too low;</p> <p>The state of California passed legislation to increase production of ADU's;</p> <p>Placer County has launched a campaign with a goal to achieve 700 ADU's. They're investing heavily in this area by creating awareness, promoting production, offering incentives and providing free plans (https://www.placer.ca.gov/accessoryhomes, https://www.facebook.com/PlacerCA/videos/4209301532422420/)</p>	Placer County and the City of Auburn both have a history of more ADUs being permitted and programs in place or developments planned that will increase the number of ADUs. Placer County issued an average of 17 permits for ADUs per year from 2013-2017 and issued 64 permits for ADUs in 2020. While Auburn only approved one ADU in 2018 and two in 2019, they approved 7 from January to September 2020 marking a significant annual increase and the City is currently reviewing a subdivision that plans for ADU development, providing an additional 64 ADUs to the projection. For both Placer County and the City of Auburn, this history of ADU development and programs, including Placer County's ADU campaign, were sufficient to make the higher ADU projections than were made for the Town of Loomis.

Bonnie London	The City of Auburn is capitalizing on the county's work and set a goal of 15 per year/120 for the 8 year cycle to meet extremely low, very low and low RHNA numbers; Auburn permitted 1 [ADU] in 2018 and 2 in 2019, Loomis permitted 4 in 2018 and 3 in 2019; Auburn's project ADU capacity is 120, Loomis's projected ADU capacity is 24??? This doesn't make sense	Loomis has issued just 7 permits for ADUs between 2018 and 2019 and does not have any planned development that would support additional ADUs. Therefore, the projection for the Town follows State guidance to estimate approximately double historic ADU trends for this planning period. If the Town exceeds ADU projections, the projections for the 7th cycle can be more aggressive.
Bonnie London	We should set a much higher [ADU] projection. A minimum of 10 ADU's per year for 80 in the 8 year cycle is extremely conservative.	
Bonnie London	Program 11: Under limited circumstances, State law allows local government to count existing units toward meeting their Regional Housing need. We have existing units and should work hard to capture them: Sierra Meadows Apartments: 28 units Taylor Road Apartments: 6 units There are more but these are the obvious ones and could add 34 units to our count	The commenter is referring to a program from the "Review of Previous Housing Element", not the current 2021-2029 Housing Element Program 11. Existing units may be counted toward the Town's RHNA if it meets one of the following criteria: 1) the unit(s) will be substantially rehabilitated to remain habitable, 2) the unit(s) will be converted from market-rate to affordable, or 3) the unit(s) are currently affordable but at risk of converting to market-rate but are preserved at affordable rates. There are no existing housing units in Loomis, including Sierra Meadows Apartments or Taylor Road Apartments, that meet any of these criteria.
Bonnie London	If we added 80 ADU's + 34 existing units, we'd be up to 114 units for Extremely Low and Low RHNA numbers. This is a better alternative than compromising commercial property which could generate much needed revenue for our town.	As described above, the Town cannot count any existing units toward RHNA. While the Town may consider increasing the ADU projection, not all can be counted toward the lower-income RHNA. SACOG conducted an affordability analysis of ADUs in the Sacramento Region, released April 2020, finding that for ADU projections jurisdictions in Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado Counties may assume that 15% of ADUs are affordable to extremely low-income households, 6% of ADUs are affordable to very low-income households, and 35% are affordable to low-income households.
Bonnie London	I understand the no-net-loss rule but also taking into consideration our significant park deficit (1 acre/1000 residents instead of 5 acres/1000 residents...we should have 35 acres and instead have 7.5 acres which includes 2 acres of parking lot!). Mark made the suggestion we should strongly consider adding more parks/open/green spaces in our more densely populated areas since that's where the people are. Makes sense and may help build community which is needed and goes along with Michele's point that we need to do more things together (hope you've seen her presentation by now because it's really, really good). It might be worthwhile to consider a slightly more dense product in the upper triangle of Heritage Park and leave the rest for park/open space/trails since it's also along the freeway. That would also conform nicely with Stonegate on the left which is also a nice and affordable product in a naturally beautiful location (https://www.realtor.com/realestateandhomes-search/Stonegate_Loomis_CA?view=map)	This is being considered by the Town, but the actions lie outside the scope of the General Plan.
Bonnie London	In terms of ideal affordable sites, not sure Heritage Park is the best location anyways. It lacks the same ease of access to groceries, schools, services and transportation as the former Village site. I really, really hope Stonebridge considers some affordable units in Hidden Groves even if we don't get an inclusionary zoning ordinance in before their project submission.	This is being considered by the Town, but the actions lie outside the scope of the General Plan.
Bonnie London	Also, in order to get some assistance for a park/open space area, developer funds will be needed so maybe a market rate, missing middle product like a cottage court or pocket neighborhood development might be more appropriate. Might be interesting to run it by Mike Paris since that seems to be BlackStone's target market. Not sure we'd want to cram 40 units in that smaller section so would still need to identify other sites but we have a surplus of inventory sites in all income levels, especially in the moderate category.	This is being considered by the Town, but the actions lie outside the scope of the General Plan.
Bonnie London	Last, I'll forward an email from someone I know who's connected with Pastor Casey at LBC UCC. I'll reach out to him but if there's interest in affordable housing on their church property, that'd be an ideal site for families because it's close to schools and I think there may be less community pushback if it's located on the church site with support from the pastor and congregation but that's a lot of "ifs".	This is being considered by the Town, but the actions lie outside the scope of the General Plan.
Jean Wilson	Does EDD data capture 16 years olds that work at Taylors?	The EDD data is a snapshot of the Placer County labor market. See edd.ca.gov for more information on the sources and methodology used to collect this information.

Matt Fox	In the discussion on affordable housing, asked for clarification to what 45 dwellings per acre looked like – 3 stories?	Yes, in order to accommodate that amount of density the project would likely have to be 3 stories tall.
Gary Liss	Can we put these occupation descriptors in the HE?	An analysis of low-income workers that identifies occupation types has been added to the Special Needs Groups discussion on page V-21 to V-22 of the Draft 2021-2029 Housing Element.
Jean Wilson	How did you determine affordability of ADUs?	SACOG conducted an affordability analysis of ADUs in the Sacramento Region, released April 2020, finding that for ADU projections jurisdictions in Sacramento, Placer, and El Dorado Counties may assume that 15% of ADUs are affordable to extremely low-income households, 6% of ADUs are affordable to very low-income households, and 35% are affordable to low-income households.
Gary Liss	In the programs, we encourage some types of units that do not have their own independent living facilities but they don't meet RHNA?	To comply with State law, the Town must allow units that do not have independent living facilities, such as Single-Room Occupancy (SRO) units, group homes, transitional housing, etc. While these do serve special needs groups, only units with independent living facilities may be counted toward the RHNA.
Matt Fox	Can we encourage the Town to consolidate Heritage Park sites to encourage MF development?	Thank you for your comment. This is outside the scope of the Housing Element.
Jean Wilson	Can the carriage units in the Taylor road mixed use project could be counted in our RHNA.	To be counted, they units must have their own entrance, kitchen, and bathroom facility. Should these units fit the criteria of an ADU, they can be counted when they are permitted. The Town's projection of 24 ADUs over the course of the planning period captures these 9 potential carriage units.
Matt Fox	Are there things the Town can do to encourage low density affordable housing?	The Town can contact affordable housing developers to identify what projects are being offered at low densities. Typically, low density affordable housing are not eligible for funding making it unlikely to be feasible for a developer.
David Ring	All of the sites are based on our current zoning, correct?	The GIS data included is based on Town records.
Gary Liss	Can we include something about requiring mixed use for the Land Use committee?	Mixed use project standards are being reviewed by the Land Use Committee and Subcommittees.
David Ring	There were lots of comments on the survey regarding "no housing" – people don't understand that we have to do this. Is there something the Town can do to educate people on State requirements?	Thank you for your comment. The Town has made public meetings at both Planning Commission and Town Council meetings to educate these bodies and the public on state requirements.