

---

LAND USE, PLANNING, POPULATION AND HOUSING

### **3.9 Land Use, Planning, Population and Housing**

This section of the Draft EIR provides a discussion of land uses at and within the vicinity of the project site and assesses the potential effects of construction and operation of the proposed project on land use. The local, state, and federal jurisdictions potentially affected by the proposed project are identified, as are their respective plans, policies, laws, and regulations (including zoning where applicable), and potentially sensitive land uses. Agricultural resources are discussed in Section 3.2. Additionally, this section discusses the existing population and housing characteristics of the proposed project area. Population growth and housing demand are considered in the Draft EIR only to the extent that they will result in physical changes to the environment.

Shasta County received NOP comments regarding land use conflicts, including concerns about the effects of relocation of retail stores from other areas, the potential “domino effect” of encouraging more commercial/industrial uses in the area and the potential generation of “sprawl” type development.

#### **3.9.1 SETTING**

##### ***Environmental Setting***

The project site is located in the southeast corner of Township 31 North, Range 4 West, Section 29, in the northeast quadrant of the I-5/Knighton Road Interchange within the Churn Creek Bottom area. Land uses within the 92 acre proposed project site are varied (see Figure 2-4 for an aerial view of the project site). The portion of the site between the north-south irrigation ditch and Churn Creek Road is occupied by two large fallow fields, an operating wholesale nursery (Gold Leaf Nursery), and an old house site. The house is no longer present, with the exception of the concrete foundation. Just west of the old house site are several abandoned wooden structures that are collapsing. The area between the irrigation ditch and I-5, and the southern terminus of Thistle Lane, is occupied by an inactive Christmas tree farm. The remainder of the project site, north of the Christmas tree farm, is occupied by a walnut orchard to the west, and a fallow pasture to the east.

##### **CURRENT AND PROPOSED LAND USES**

Figures 3.9-1 and 3.9-2 show current land use designations and zoning, respectively. Currently, approximately 6 acres of the 92-acre project site is designated Commercial (C), and the remainder is designated Part-Time Agriculture (A-cg). The proposed project requires amending the General Plan land use designations for approximately 86 acres of the project site from Part-Time Agricultural (A-cg) to Commercial (C); and amending the zone district for the same portion of the property from Limited Agriculture (A-1) to Planned Development (PD), incorporating a comprehensive development plan for the site. The project is also within the Restrictive Flood (F-2) combining district, which will not change with the proposed zone amendment (see Figures 3.9-3 and 3.9-4).

The proposed General Plan land use designation for the entire project site is Commercial (C). The Commercial designation is intended to provide a wide range of facilities for the sale of goods and provision of personal services. It may include highway commercial uses to provide for the needs of recreation and business visitors. These uses may include retail shops, restaurants, lodging, food supplies, recreation activities and equipment, traveler services and entertainment-related facilities. The General Plan specifies that appropriate locations for these types of highway commercial uses include properties along access roads to I-5 (*Shasta County General Plan*).

The proposed zoning designation for the entire project site is Planned Development (PD). The Planned Development designation is intended to provide for developments that, because of a mix of building types, land uses or residential lot sizes, do not fit within the parameter of standard zone districts. Planned developments often provide common areas and other amenities not normally found in standard types of development. This district is consistent with all general plan designations that provide for substantial residential, commercial or industrial development, provided the proposed uses are consistent with the general plan designation(s) within which the project is located.

#### **SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING**

Surrounding land uses in the project vicinity are shown in Figure 2-4. The area to the north and east is small-scale agricultural land and rural residences. Southeast of the project site is Pacheco Union Elementary School. South of the project site is the TA Travel Center, a large truck and auto fueling complex. Immediately to the west the site is bordered by Interstate 5 (I-5). On the west side of I-5 the land use is small-scale agricultural with residences.

#### **URBAN DECAY ANALYSIS**

In January 2009, Economic & Planning Systems, Inc., (EPS), was contracted to evaluate the potential for ‘urban decay’ to result from development of the Knighton and Churn Creek Commons Retail Center. The full report dated October, 2009 can be found in [Appendix L](#). The urban decay analysis has been conducted for the County pursuant to CEQA, and serves as an informational document in preparation of this EIR. The analysis addressed the following primary issues:

- How will the proposed Knighton and Churn Creek Commons Project, and other approved projects, individually and cumulatively affect the short-term and long-term performance of the retail sector in the City of Redding and related markets?
- How will the potential impacts estimated above affect the physical environment in the City of Redding and related markets? Specifically, does the Project possess the potential to start an economic chain-reaction that could lead to physical deterioration of the built environment and, ultimately, cause urban decay?

### **Overview on Urban Decay**

Urban decay is a physical effect that can result from extended vacancy, deferred maintenance, and abandonment. CEQA requires that economic impacts that may cause a physical change in the environment, such as urban decay, be fully analyzed as part of the development review process. CEQA describes the role of urban decay in determining the significance of environmental effects caused by a project in Article 5, Section 15064 (e):

Where a physical change is caused by economic or social effects of a project, the physical change may be regarded as a significant effect in the same manner as any other physical change resulting from the project. Alternatively, economic and social effects of a physical change may be used to determine that the physical change is a significant effect on the environment. If the physical change causes adverse economic or social effects on people, those adverse effects may be used as a factor in determining whether the physical change is significant. For example, if a project would cause overcrowding of a public facility and the overcrowding causes an adverse effect on people, the overcrowding would be regarded as a significant effect.

### **Local Context**

Redding is located at the northern end of California's Sacramento Valley. As of 2008, it was home to approximately 90,500 residents and 37,000 households according to the California Department of Finance. Redding is the largest City, county seat, and major employment base of Shasta County. As of 2008, Shasta County had approximately 181,000 residents and 73,000 households according to the Department of Finance. Growth projections from Claritas, the Department of Finance, and Shasta Regional Transportation Planning Agency (Shasta RTPA) estimate average annual growth for Redding at between 1.5 to 1.7 percent.

### **Summary of Findings**

#### **Project-Specific Findings.**

- Based on the Analysis completed by EPS, the Project's individual impacts are not anticipated to cause urban decay. The Project's trade areas are currently estimated to have a slight oversupply of retail that would continue up to the Project's development. The Project is estimated to increase this oversupply after its projected absorption (in approximately 2015) but, when analyzed exclusively, it would have a negligible impact over time that is not considered conducive to urban decay.
- When analyzed cumulatively, though, with all other approved retail development in the Redding market area, a potential for urban decay is identified. The cumulative impact of developing the Project and approved retail projects in the Redding area could create an oversupply that would increase the extent and duration of the Redding area market's oversupply, potentially triggering the physical abandonment of buildings.

- The potential of urban decay could be avoided or mitigated by a variety of factors, including those below:
  - Market adaptation of existing centers.
  - Repositioning of existing centers to non-retail uses.
  - Encouraging a mix of diverse tenants to prevent excessive competition.
- A significant amount of retail space, including the square footage encompassed by the Project, is currently being proposed for Redding. Redding currently possesses an estimated 3.7 million square feet of retail space in major shopping centers. In addition to the current inventory and the space anticipated in the Knighton and Churn Creek Commons Project, Redding's retail supply could increase by an additional 740,000 square feet by 2015 from other projects currently engaged in the development process. This would represent a 28 percent total increase in the existing known inventory of retail space by 2015. In comparison, the population within the market trade areas is projected to increase by 9.5 percent.

**Overall Findings.**

- Redding serves as a regional retail hub for Shasta County and beyond. The rural nature of northern Sacramento Valley has ramifications for retail development in the Redding area. Residents of outlying areas in Shasta County have few opportunities for shopping besides those in Redding, which is the closest major shopping area. Furthermore, shoppers travel from areas outside Shasta County, including northern Tehama County and eastern Trinity County.
- The Redding retail market is facing challenging conditions that reflect nationwide economic trends. A variety of store closures have resulted in several vacancies of large 'big box' spaces, both in new and older shopping centers. Most of these closures are the result of current national restructuring in the retail sector rather than poor local performance. However, brokers interviewed as part of this Analysis indicated that lease rates in some shopping centers have declined and owners are increasingly offering incentives. The recovery of the Redding area retail sector and its health over the long-term will depend on sustained growth in population and employment and the ability of existing shopping centers to respond to changes in consumer demand.
- Downtown Redding, with its historic architecture, expanding arts venues, and ongoing downtown Mall redevelopment, has the potential to become a community destination offering cultural amenities in a pedestrian-friendly environment. Current redevelopment efforts in the downtown are focused on making it a unique destination for dining, entertainment, and boutique retail establishments. Positioning the downtown in this way should help it avoid urban decay impacts resulting from the Project or other new retail shopping centers.

## POPULATION

Since incorporation, the City of Redding has grown to a population of approximately 89,780, and the City of Anderson has grown to a population of approximately 10,537, as reported by the U.S. Census Bureau, 2007 Population Estimates. [Table 3.9-1](#) below summarizes population and percent population change for the City of Redding and Anderson, Shasta County and California between 1990 and 2000. In 1990, the population of the Redding was 66,462, and by 2000 its population had increased to 80,865. This was an increase of approximately 22 percent, which was higher than Shasta County and California's increases in population for the same time period. In 1990, the population of Anderson was 8,299, and by 2000 its population has increased to 9,022. This was an increase of approximately 9 percent, which was lower than Shasta County's and California's increases in populations for the same time period. From 2000 to 2007, the City of Redding's population increased approximately 11 percent to 89,780, while the City of Anderson's population increased approximately 17 percent to 10,537. Shasta County and California's population increases from 2000 to 2008 were 10.4 and 8.5 percent, respectively.

**Table 3.9-1  
Historical Population Growth – Cities of Anderson and Redding, Shasta County and California, 1990-2007**

	1990 Population	2000 Population	% Change 1990 to 2000	2007 Population	% Change 2000 to 2007 <sup>1</sup>
City of Anderson	8,299	9,022	8.7	10,537	16.8
City of Redding	66,462	80,865	21.7	89,780	11.0
Shasta County	147,036	163,256	11.0	180,214	10.4 <sup>1</sup>
California	29,760,021	33,871,648	13.8	36,756,666	8.5 <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Shasta County and California as of the U.S. Census Bureau, 2008 Population Estimates

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2008 and 2007 Population Estimates, Census 2000, 1990 Census; Quad Knopf, Inc.

[Table 3.9-2](#) below shows population estimates and projections for the Anderson, Redding, Shasta County and California for the period 2000 to 2020. Population projections for the City of Redding were obtained from the City of Redding Housing element while the Shasta County and California population projection data was obtained from the California Department of Finance. The City of Anderson 2000 and 2007 population projection was obtained from the Census Bureau while the 2010 and 2020 population projections were estimated based on the previous eight year annual growth rate.

**Table 3.9-2  
Population Estimates and Projections – Cities of Anderson and Redding, Shasta County and California, 2000-2020**

	City of Anderson	City of Redding	Shasta County	California
2000	9,022	80,865	163,256	33,871,648
2007	10,537	89,780	180,214	36,756,666
2010	11,006 <sup>1</sup>	96,769	191,722	39,135,676
2020	12,992 <sup>1</sup>	113,500	224,386	44,135,923

<sup>1</sup> Estimates based on the yearly population growth rates between 2000 and 2008

Source: California Department of Finance; Census Bureau; City of Redding Housing Element; Quad Knopf, Inc.

Table 3.9-3 below summarizes the City of Anderson, Redding and Shasta County’s Number of Households, Population in Households, and Average Household Size for 2000 and 2008. In 2000, the City of Anderson and Redding’s Average Household Size was 2.64 and 2.45 respectively, while the county’s Average Household Size was 2.52. Average Household Sizes in the City of Anderson and Redding in 2008 were 2.64 and 2.44, respectively, while the county’s Average Household Size was 2.51.

**Table 3.9-3  
Household Estimates – Cities of Anderson and Redding and Shasta County**

Area	Number of Households		Population in Households <sup>1</sup>		Average Household Size	
	2000	2008	2000	2008	2000	2008
City of Anderson	3,581	4,203	8,909	10,461	2.64	2.64
City of Redding	33,802	38,018	78,488	88,034	2.45	2.44
Shasta County	68,810	77,118	159,897	178,790	2.52	2.51

<sup>1</sup> The “Population in Households” data does not include individuals residing in group quarters.

Source: California Department of Finance, City/County Population and Housing estimates, 1/1/2008.

## HOUSING

Table 3.9-4 below identifies total housing units for the City of Anderson, Redding and Shasta County in 1990 and 2000.

**Table 3.9-4  
Total Housing Units – Cities of Anderson and Redding and Shasta County**

	Housing Units		% Increase 1990 to 2000
	1990	2000	
City of Anderson	3,234	3,577	10.6%
City of Redding	27,238	33,802	24.1%
Shasta County	60,552	68,810	13.6%

Source: U.S. Census 1990; US Census 2000 and the California Department of Finance.

According to the 2000 US Census, the City of Anderson and Redding had 3,577 and 33,802 housing units respectively. In Anderson 69 percent of the total housing units were single family detached homes, while in Redding 67 percent of the total housing units were single family detached homes. Comparatively, Shasta County had 68,810 housing units in 2000, 69 percent of which were single family detached homes.

## Regulatory Setting

### FEDERAL

No federal regulations critical to the assessment of this impact were noted.

**STATE**

**California Health and Safety Code (Section 33030-33039)**

**Section 33030:**

- (a) It is found and declared that there exist in many communities blighted areas which constitute physical and economic liabilities, requiring redevelopment in the interest of the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of these communities and of the state.
- (b) A blighted area is one that contains both of the following:
  - (1) An area that is predominantly urbanized, as that term is defined in Section 33320.1, and is an area in which the combination of conditions set forth in Section 33031 is so prevalent and so substantial that it causes a reduction of, or lack of, proper utilization of the area to such an extent that it constitutes a serious physical and economic burden on the community which cannot reasonably be expected to be reversed or alleviated by private enterprise or governmental action, or both, without redevelopment.
  - (2) An area that is characterized by either of the following:
    - (A) One or more conditions set forth in any paragraph of subdivision (a) of Section 33031 and one or more conditions set forth in any paragraph of subdivision (b) of Section 33031.
    - (B) The condition described in paragraph (4) of subdivision (a) of Section 33031.
- (c) A blighted area also may be one that contains the conditions described in subdivision (b) and is, in addition, characterized by the existence of inadequate public improvements, parking facilities, or utilities.

**Section 33031:**

- (a) This subdivision describes physical conditions that cause blight:
  - (1) Buildings in which it is unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work. These conditions can be caused by serious building code violations, dilapidation and deterioration, defective design or physical construction, faulty or inadequate utilities, or other similar factors.
  - (2) Factors that prevent or substantially hinder the economically viable use or capacity of buildings or lots. This condition can be caused by a substandard design, inadequate size given present standards and market conditions, lack of parking, or other similar factors.
  - (3) Adjacent or nearby uses that are incompatible with each other and which prevent the economic development of those parcels or other portions of the project area.

(4) The existence of subdivided lots of irregular form and shape and inadequate size for proper usefulness and development that are in multiple ownership.

(b) This subdivision describes economic conditions that cause blight:

(1) Depreciated or stagnant property values or impaired investments, including, but not necessarily limited to, those properties containing hazardous wastes that require the use of agency authority as specified in Article 12.5 (commencing with Section 33459).

(2) Abnormally high business vacancies, abnormally low lease rates, high turnover rates, abandoned buildings, or excessive vacant lots within an area developed for urban use and served by utilities.

(3) A lack of necessary commercial facilities that are normally found in neighborhoods, including grocery stores, drug stores, and banks and other lending institutions.

(4) Residential overcrowding or an excess of bars, liquor stores, or other businesses that cater exclusively to adults, that has led to problems of public safety and welfare.

(5) A high crime rate that constitutes a serious threat to the public safety and welfare.

**Section 33035:**

It is further found and declared that:

(a) The existence of blighted areas characterized by any or all of such conditions constitutes a serious and growing menace which is condemned as injurious and inimical to the public health, safety, and welfare of the people of the communities in which they exist and of the people of the State.

(b) Such blighted areas present difficulties and handicaps which are beyond remedy and control solely by regulatory processes in the exercise of police power.

(c) They contribute substantially and increasingly to the problems of, and necessitate excessive and disproportionate expenditures for, crime prevention, correction, prosecution, and punishment, the treatment of juvenile delinquency, the preservation of the public health and safety, and the maintaining of adequate police, fire, and accident protection and other public services and facilities.

(d) This menace is becoming increasingly direct and substantial in its significance and effect.

(e) The benefits which will result from the remedying of such conditions and the redevelopment of blighted areas will accrue to all the inhabitants and property owners of the communities in which they exist.

**Section 33036:**

It is further found and declared that:

- (a) Such conditions of blight tend to further obsolescence, deterioration, and disuse because of the lack of incentive to the individual landowner and his inability to improve, modernize, or rehabilitate his property while the condition of the neighboring properties remains unchanged.
- (b) As a consequence the process of deterioration of a blighted area frequently cannot be halted or corrected except by redeveloping the entire area, or substantial portions of it.
- (c) Such conditions of blight are chiefly found in areas subdivided into small parcels, held in divided and widely scattered ownerships, frequently under defective titles, and in many such instances the private assembly of the land in blighted areas for redevelopment is so difficult and costly that it is uneconomic and as a practical matter impossible for owners to undertake because of lack of the legal power and excessive costs.
- (d) The remedying of such conditions may require the public acquisition at fair prices of adequate areas, the clearance of the areas through demolition of existing obsolete, inadequate, unsafe, and unsanitary buildings, and the redevelopment of the areas suffering from such conditions under proper supervision, with appropriate planning, and continuing land use and construction policies.

**Section 33037:**

For these reasons it is declared to be the policy of the State:

- (a) To protect and promote the sound development and redevelopment of blighted areas and the general welfare of the inhabitants of the communities in which they exist by remedying such injurious conditions through the employment of all appropriate means.
- (b) That whenever the redevelopment of blighted areas cannot be accomplished by private enterprise alone, without public participation and assistance in the acquisition of land, in planning and in the financing of land assembly, in the work of clearance, and in the making of improvements necessary therefore, it is in the public interest to employ the power of eminent domain, to advance or expend public funds for these purposes, and to provide a means by which blighted areas may be redeveloped or rehabilitated.
- (c) That the redevelopment of blighted areas and the provisions for appropriate continuing land use and construction policies in them constitute public uses and purposes for which public money may be advanced or expended and private property acquired, and are governmental functions of state concern in the interest of health, safety, and welfare of the people of the State and of the communities in which the areas exist.
- (d) That the necessity in the public interest for the provisions of this part is declared to be a matter of legislative determination.

## LOCAL

### ***Shasta County Zoning Ordinance***

State law requires that local zoning be consistent with adopted General Plans. The applicant is proposing zoning reclassification for the project site consistent with proposed changes in the General Plan land use designations. The current zoning for the subject property is Planned Development, Limited Agriculture (A-1) and portions of the area are also in the Restrictive Flood (F-2) combining district. The F-2 zoning district requires project-related facilities to be constructed a minimum of one foot above the base year flood level. The proposed zoning for the project site is Planned Development (PD).

**Planned Development Standards.** Any use or combination of uses which are arranged and designed in such a manner as to result in a development which is internally compatible, compatible with surrounding uses and consistent with the general plan may be permitted in the PD district.

Applications for a PD district shall contain a conceptual development plan for the project site showing the approximate locations of buildings, building elevations, roads, walkways, parking and landscaping, the proposed uses of the buildings and grounds, staging of the development and other information which the planning director may require to properly evaluate and process the application.

Prior to construction of site improvements and structures in a PD district, detailed plans shall be submitted to the planning director for checking and approval to ensure reasonably close conformity with the approved conceptual development plans and with the intent of section 17.62 of the Zoning Ordinance. The decision of the planning director may be appealed to the planning commission, as specified in Section 17.94.060.

- **Landscaping:** Landscaping requirements are as specified in Section 17.84.040.

The following general landscaping requirements apply:

#### A. Areas requiring Landscaping

1. **Parking Areas.** Open Parking areas containing five or more required vehicle spaces which abut a public street shall be landscaped to a depth of ten feet, measured from the abutting street right-of-way line, with openings for walkway and/or driveway purposes, in accordance with county standards.
2. **Large Parking Areas.** Open Parking areas, excluding underground or structural parking, which contain twenty or more spaces, shall landscape a minimum of five percent of the gross lot area used for off-street parking and access thereto, exclusive of any landscaped strip abutting the street right-of-way or area used for walkways or driveways. This required landscaping shall include one tree, or a species suited to the area climate zone, for every eight parking spaces.

3. Parking next to residential areas. A minimum three-foot-wide landscaped strip shall be planted and maintained along the edge of parking areas that abut residential districts. This shall be counted as a part of the five percent landscaped area described in subsection (A) (2), if applicable.
  4. Commercial, Industrial, and Multi-family yard Areas. For commercial, industrial or multifamily residential uses, required yards adjoining public streets shall be landscaped to a depth of ten feet.
  5. Adjacent to Freeways. A use in a commercial or industrial district whose side or rear yard abuts a freeway right-of-way shall have a ten-foot-wide screened landscaped area and shall include trees planted on forty-foot-on-center spaces, with a minimum of three trees.
- B. Landscaping Material. Required landscaping may consist of a combination of plant and non-plant material, provided no less than fifty percent of the required landscaped area shall be living plant material, based on mature plant size.
  - C. Watering. All required planted areas shall be served with adequate and permanent watering systems, except where native plants that do not need a watering system are used. All plants shall be maintained in a living condition.
  - D. Border Materials. Except where abutting a sidewalk, all required landscaped areas shall be enclosed by either a concrete curb having a minimum height of six inches or a wooden frame constructed from materials such as railroad ties or other heavy lumber materials which measure no less than six inches in diameter.
  - E. Maintenance. All required landscaped areas shall be maintained in a neat and clean condition.
  - F. Sight Distance. In order to provide safe sight distance at driveways and street intersections, all plant material within a thirty-foot triangle at the intersection of streets, and a fifteen-foot triangle at the intersection of driveways and streets, shall be no more than two feet in height above the curb level, except for trees which are trimmed so that no branches extend lower than six feet above curb level.
  - G. Exception. Any portion of this section may be modified if a use permit is obtained.
  - H. Landscaping Plan. All landscaping required by this section shall be installed and maintained in accordance with a landscaping plan. The plan shall be submitted to and approved by the planning director prior to issuance of a building permit or use permit, and shall show the location, size and variety of all plantings, water supply and other pertinent improvements. This plan may be combined with a parking plan.
- **Outdoor Lighting:** Outdoor lighting requirements are as specified in Section 17.84.050. All lighting, exterior and interior shall be designed and located so as to confine direct lighting to the premises. A light source shall not shine upon or illuminate directly on any surface other

than the area required to be lighted. No lighting shall be of the type or in a location such that constitutes a hazard to vehicular traffic, either on private property or on abutting streets.

- **Parking:** Parking requirements are as specified in Chapter 17.86
- **Outdoor Trash Storage:** All outside trash storage and collection facilities shall be enclosed by a solid masonry wall or view-obstructing fence at least one foot higher than the trash container.

**Shasta County General Plan**

Policy CO-r: The County should develop specific plans for the Burney, Cottonwood, and Palo Cedro areas. The County should also develop a specific plan for the Churn Creek Bottom area with emphasis on maintaining and preserving a variety of long-range agricultural options for the area.

Policy CO-u: Commercial development in the Churn Creek Bottom area shall be strictly limited to the I-5 interchange/Knighton Road intersection.

Policy CO-w: The County shall determine appropriate commercial/industrial building intensity through the use of building setbacks, floor areas, heights, and parking/loading requirements as well as related site/building design standards.

Table 3.9-5 provides a discussion of the proposed project’s consistency with applicable portions of Shasta County General Plan Policies related to land use, planning, population and housing.

**Table 3.9-5  
General Plan Consistency – Land Use, Planning, Population and Housing**

Policy No.	Finding	Discussion
CO-r	Consistent	The policy concerning developing a specific plan for the Churn Creek Bottom area is not prescriptive or mandatory.
CO-u	Consistent	The policy does not define the extent to which commercial development may occur around the I-5 interchange/Knighton Road intersection. The proposed project appears consistent with this policy; however, a final interpretation must be provided by the Board of Supervisors concerning the extent of commercial development to be permitted at the intersection.
CO-w	Consistent	The project will be subject to all County code requirements concerning building setbacks, floor areas, heights, and parking/loading requirements as well as related site/building design standards.

**3.9.2 THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Potential impacts to land use, population and housing are evaluated by comparing project characteristics with the regional and local land use environment. A summary of impacts related to land use, zoning designations, population and housing in the Shasta County community as a result of the Knighton & Churn Creek Commons Retail Center is presented in this section. Criteria used in determining whether project-related land use, population and housing impacts

are significant are consistent with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. An impact is determined to be significant if it will:

- Physically divide an established community;
- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the Shasta County General Plan) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.
- Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure);
- Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; or
- Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

### **3.9.3 IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

#### ***Impact #3.9-1: Physical division of an established community.***

**Discussion/Conclusion:** Implementation of the project uses would occur within the boundaries of the project site and would not require modifications to any surrounding neighborhoods or changes in surrounding uses. Nor would the project block any public rights-of-way that are used by residents to travel from one part of the Churn Creek Bottom community to another. (Impacts to current views across the project site are addressed in Section 3.1).

The project site is currently integrated into the Churn Creek Bottom community as an area of small-scale agricultural use with minimal commercial development, consistent with the largely rural character of the community. However, while land-use conflicts may occur, the introduction of commercial buildings at the location of the proposed project site would not result in the physical division of a community due to the presence of commercial development to the south and the presence of I-5 adjacent to the project site on the west which already serves as a substantial division between the western and eastern portions of the community. This is a *less-than-significant* impact.

#### ***Mitigation Measures***

No mitigation measures are required.

**Impact #3.9-2: Conflicts with land use policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.**

**Discussion/Conclusion:** The General Plan (Policy CO-r) states that the County should develop a specific plan for the Churn Creek Bottom area, where the proposed project site is located, which should emphasize maintaining and preserving a variety of long-range agricultural options for the area (Impacts to Agricultural Resources and related General Plan policies are addressed in Section 3.2.). However, the policy is suggestive rather than prescriptive or mandatory. General Plan Policy CO-u states that “commercial development in the Churn Creek Bottom area shall be strictly limited to the I-5 interchange/Knighton Road intersection.” The proposed project extends commercial development approximately one-half mile north along Interstate 5 and approximately one-half mile north along Churn Creek Road. Because Policy CO-u does not define boundaries for commercial development at the I-5 interchange/Knighton Road intersection nor states what environmental effects it is designed to mitigate or avoid, this impact is considered *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are required.

**Impact #3.9-3: Potential land use conflicts created by pressure to convert additional land to commercial uses.**

**Discussion/Conclusion:** Development of the proposed retail center may generate interest by developers to propose complementary developments, such as residential development, which would convert additional land from agricultural uses. In addition, the project will increase traffic in the Churn Creek Bottom area, which could also encourage further commercial development, especially given the proximity of I-5. The development of these additional commercial uses might cause environmental impacts to existing neighborhoods as well as to Pacheco School. Potential indirect conversion of agricultural lands is addressed under Impact #3.2-2. The mere existence of the proposed retail center does not guarantee that it will create pressures to convert other land for commercial uses. Nevertheless, the project is likely to generate demand for additional commercial sites and residential development in and around the Churn Creek Bottom area, potentially causing future land-use incompatibilities. Therefore, this impact is considered *potentially significant*.

**Mitigation Measures**

There are no available mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. The impact remains *significant and unavoidable*.

**Impact #3.9-4: Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.**

**Discussion/Conclusion:** There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community, Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans for the project site or project area. There is *no impact*.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

No mitigation measures are required.

#### ***Impact #3.9-5: Directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth.***

**Discussion/Conclusion:** Direct population growth occurs when a project results in the construction of a substantial amount of new housing or otherwise directly causes a substantial increase in the area's population. The proposed project will not directly induce population growth since residential units are not proposed with this project. Indirect growth inducement occurs when a project extends infrastructure to undeveloped areas or otherwise removes obstacles to population growth. Surrounding land uses include I-5 to the west, the Travel Associates truck stop to the south, a partially developed rural residential neighborhood to the east, and a rural residential neighborhood to the north. Pacheco Elementary School is located southeast of the project site at the southeast corner of Knighton Road and Churn Creek Road. Agricultural land uses and rural residential dwellings are located to the west of I-5. The proposed project could indirectly induce population growth by encouraging extension of infrastructure from Redding or Anderson closer to these undeveloped or lesser developed areas; however, a significant increase in population is not expected. This impact is *less than significant*.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

No mitigation measures are required.

#### ***Impact #3.9-6: Displace substantial numbers of people and/or existing housing, thereby necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.***

**Discussion/Conclusion:** Implementation of the proposed project will result in the demolition of one existing residential unit. The displacement of one existing residential unit will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. There is *no impact*.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

No mitigation measures are required.

## **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

#### ***Impact #3.9-7: Land use conflicts created by cumulative pressure to convert additional land to commercial uses.***

**Discussion/Conclusion:** Development of the proposed retail center, in combination with other projects, may generate interest by developers to propose complementary developments, which would convert additional land from agricultural uses. In addition, the proposed project will increase traffic in the Churn Creek Bottom area, which could also encourage commercial or

residential development, especially given the proximity of I-5. The development of these additional commercial uses might cause environmental impacts to existing neighborhoods as well as to Pacheco School. Potential indirect conversion of agricultural lands is addressed under Impact #3.2-2. The mere existence of the proposed retail center does not guarantee that it will create pressures to convert this land for commercial or residential uses. Nevertheless, the project is likely to generate demand for commercial sites and residential development in and around the Churn Creek Bottom area, causing future land-use incompatibilities. Therefore, this impact is considered *cumulatively considerable* and therefore *potentially significant*.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

There are no available mitigation measures which would reduce this impact to a *less-than-significant* level. The impact remains *cumulatively significant and unavoidable*.

### ***Impact #3.9-8: Potential urban decay impacts to the City of Redding which could lead to abandonment of existing buildings.***

**Discussion/Conclusion:** When analyzed cumulatively, potential for urban decay exists as the result of development of the proposed retail center, and all other, existing, approved, and potential retail developments in the Redding market area. The cumulative impact of developing the proposed project and approved or potential retail projects in the Redding area could increase the extent and duration of the Redding area market's oversupply, possibly triggering the physical abandonment of existing buildings. With the potential to trigger physical abandonment of existing buildings this impact is *significant*.

### ***Mitigation Measures***

Although the potential of urban decay could be avoided or reduced by a variety of factors, including; market adaptation of existing centers, repositioning of existing centers to non-retail uses or encouraging a mix of diverse tenants to prevent excessive competition, it is uncertain that these measures have the full potential to reduce abandonment of existing buildings and implementation of the measures are beyond the control of Shasta County or the project applicant. This impact is considered *cumulatively significant and unavoidable*.