

6.0 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

This section of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzes the potential environmental consequences of the foreseeable growth and development that could be induced by implementation of the proposed project.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Section 15126(d) of the State *CEQA Guidelines* requires that the growth inducing effects of a proposed project be addressed in an EIR. The evaluation of whether a project would result in growth inducing effects focuses on the consideration of factors outlined in §15126.2(d) of the State *CEQA Guidelines*, which are described below.

6.2 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Sections 15126(d) and 15126.2(d) of the State *CEQA Guidelines* require that an EIR analyze growth inducing impacts and state that an EIR should discuss the ways in which the project could foster economic or population growth or construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. This section examines ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. An assessment of other projects that could affect the environment, individually or cumulatively, is also required. To address this issue, potential growth inducing effects were examined through analysis of the following questions:

- *Would the project remove obstacles to growth (e.g., through the construction or extension of major infrastructure facilities that do not presently exist in the project area, or through changes in existing regulations pertaining to land development)?*
- *Would this project result in the need to expand one or more public services to maintain desired levels of service?*
- *Would this project foster population growth (e.g., construction of additional housing), either directly or indirectly?*
- *Would this project encourage or facilitate economic effects that could result in other activities that could significantly affect the environment?*
- *Would this project promote the development of or encroachment on an isolated or adjacent area of open space (being distinct from an in-fill project)?*
- *Would approval of this project involve some precedent-setting action that could encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment?*

State *CEQA Guidelines* require an EIR to “discuss the ways” a project could be growth inducing and to “discuss the characteristics of some projects that may encourage...activities that could significantly affect the environment.” However, the State *CEQA Guidelines* do not require that an EIR predict (or speculate) specifically where such growth would occur, in what form it would occur, or when it would

occur. The answers to such questions require speculation, which CEQA discourages; refer to State *CEQA Guidelines* §15145.

It should be noted that growth inducing effects are not to be construed as necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment (State *CEQA Guidelines*, §15126.2[d]). This issue is presented to provide additional information on ways in which the proposed project could contribute to significant changes in the environment beyond the direct consequences of developing the proposed land uses as described in earlier sections of this Draft EIR.

REMOVAL OF OBSTACLES TO GROWTH

Land development projects can remove barriers and constraints or provide new or improved access, thus encouraging growth in the area that has been already planned or approved through the general planning process. This planned growth is reflected in the general plan land use element, approved with the underlying assumption that adequate infrastructure facilities to support the growth would be constructed at a pace consistent with the timing of development. This type of growth inducement is referred to as accommodating or facilitating growth. In addition, a project can remove barriers, provide new access or otherwise encourage growth that is not assumed as planned growth in the general plans or growth projections. This could include areas that are currently designated for open space, agricultural uses or other similar non-urban land uses, which, because of the improved access provided by the development, would experience pressure to develop into urban uses or to develop at a higher level of intensity than originally anticipated.

The proposed project would construct a medical wellness campus limited to the project site depicted on Figure 3-2, AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH, in Section 3.0, PROJECT DESCRIPTION, of this Draft EIR. Mitigation measures associated with traffic impacts would require improvements outside of the project boundaries (refer to mitigation measure **MM 5.14-1**, **MM 5.14-3** and **MM 5.14-4** in Section 5.14, TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION). These improvements would modify the affected roadways and intersection to accommodate traffic associated with the proposed project. Some of the modifications would benefit future growth in the region, however the roadways and intersections exist today and the modifications can be considered an incremental enlargement to the existing road network rather than the removal of an obstacle to growth. As discussed in Section 5.16, UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS, there are adequate electricity, natural gas, water, stormwater, and sewer services for the proposed project; therefore, there is no need to extension of major infrastructure.

In addition, the anticipated increase in infrastructure demands associated with the proposed project would not reduce or impair any existing or future levels of utility services, either locally or regionally as the costs for increases in utilities would be met through cooperative agreements between the developers and servicing entities. Therefore, the proposed project would not be considered growth inducing, inasmuch as it would not remove an impediment to growth.

EXPANSION OF PUBLIC SERVICES

Substantial increases in population growth may tax existing community services and facilities, thus requiring the construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. The construction of new facilities may also result in the need to expand the service capacity, which would then allow future population growth. As described in Section 1.0, INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE, Section 2.0, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, and Section 5.12, PUBLIC SERVICES, the effect the proposed project

would have on other public services, such as schools, police, fire, library and general municipal services, has been analyzed. As noted, there is no anticipated significant impact that would require mitigation. Fire, protection, law enforcement, and other City services would be expanded only as necessary to meet project demand. In particular, as discussed in Section 5.12, PUBLIC SERVICES, existing police and fire protection services have sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project. In addition, the project would be required to pay fees to ensure adequate facilities and services are in place to meet project demands. Because adequate public services are available to serve the project or the proposed project would provide or ensure that additional public services would be available to meet project demands (i.e., police, fire), the project would not facilitate additional development requiring public services. Expansion of public services beyond what is currently planned for would not result from implementation of the proposed project.

FOSTER POPULATION GROWTH

Population

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in direct population growth because it does not include the construction of housing units. As discussed in Section 5.11, POPULATION AND HOUSING, the proposed project the proposed project would require approximately 180 full time employees. Based on a 2.38 average household size for Redding, the addition of 180 full time employees would potentially increase the City of Redding population by 428 persons, assuming all employees would relocate from outside the local area with families. The increase of 428 residents would represent a less than 1 percent increase to the City's current population (91,357 residents).

Potential growth inducing impacts are also assessed based on a project's consistency with adopted plans that have addressed growth management from a local and regional standpoint. The City of Redding's *General Plan* build-out population forecast is 210,292 persons (Redding, 2000). The proposed project would not cause the City's build-out population to be exceeded. Additionally, the Shasta Regional Transportation Agency (SRTA) projects that the City's population will grow to approximately 111,002 residents by 2035 (SRTA, 2015). The proposed project would also not cause SRTA's 2035 population forecast for the City to be exceeded.

The Shasta County *General Plan* build-out population forecast for unincorporated Shasta County is approximately 162,900 residents. The *General Plan* assumes that the unincorporated area of the County would continue to account for approximately 40 percent of the total County population (Shasta County, 2004). Based on the most recent available data, the current population of unincorporated Shasta County is 66,508 residents (DOF, 2018). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would induce *less than significant* population growth in the County with respect to *General Plan* forecasts.

Housing

Based on the City of Redding 2014-2019 Housing Element, the City anticipates housing growth of approximately 1,000 housing units in the 2014-2019 planning period. Additionally, based on the Vacant Residential Land Inventory (Table 10 in the 2014-2019 Housing Element), there is vacant land that is zoned to accommodate 21,217 dwelling units. Based on the average of 2.38 persons per a household, the existing vacant land would accommodate 50,497 additional residents.

Based on the land inventory summary (Table IV-2) of the Shasta County 2009-2014 Housing Element, there is the potential for the development in unincorporated Shasta County of 7,636 dwelling units. Based on the average of 2.48 persons per household in unincorporated Shasta County, the existing vacant land would accommodate 18,937 additional residents (DOF, 2018).

As discussed in Section 5.11, POPULATION AND HOUSING, the City has an estimated 39,679 housing units (27,116 single-family units), with a vacancy rate of 5.5 percent and the County as a whole has an estimated 78,745 housing units (57,355 single-family units), with a vacancy rate of 8.1 percent. As a result, available housing stock exists within the City to accommodate the increase in population and the proposed project would not foster construction of additional housing.

PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

The promotion of economic growth is the extent to which a proposed project could cause increased activity in the local or regional economy. A “multiplier effect” is an economic phrase, which pertains to the interrelationships between the various sectors of the economy. The multiplier effect is a quantitative description and can be described as how an increase in some economic activity starts a chain reaction that generates more activity than the original increase.

General Plan Considerations

During development of the *General Plan* the City planned for residential and commercial development to accommodate population projections. To account for the planned residential growth within the area covered by the *General Plan*, the City identified a variety of non-residential designated areas to support the future residents. The non-residential areas are designated for commercial, employment uses such as office and industrial, mixed use, public facilities, and open space. These non-residential uses are intended to accommodate the economic growth anticipated to occur through buildout of the *General Plan*.

The proposed project is located within a developed area in southeast Redding designated in the *General Plan* as “General Office” (GO), “General Commercial” (GC), and “Greenway” (GWY), and is zoned “General Office” (GO), “General Commercial” (GC), and “Open Space” (OS). The project proposes to amend the *General Plan* from these existing land use classifications to “Public Facilities” (PF-I) to accommodate a 129,600 square-foot wellness and prevention campus with up to 180 full-time employees. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in further economic development beyond the development anticipated from buildout of the City’s *General Plan*.

Employment

At the height of project construction, up to 40 construction workers would commute to the site on a daily basis. This workforce represents a minimal increase in employment during the construction period. Construction workers are expected to travel to the project site from various locations throughout the northern Central Valley, and the number of workers expected to relocate to the surrounding area is not expected to be significant. The proposed project would not create a temporary or substantial increase in the demand for construction worker housing. Because construction would be temporary, occurring over a relatively short period, it is not likely that it would require substantial numbers of people to relocate to the City or foster local economic growth.

Operation of the proposed project would require up to 180 new full-time employees. As seen in Section 5.11, POPULATION AND HOUSING, the City of Redding currently has an unemployment rate of 4.8 percent, and a labor force of 39,400. The addition of 480 employees would represent an increase of 0.01 percent to the labor force. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to generate a substantial amount of new employment beyond existing conditions. The jobs created and maintained during both the construction and operation phases of the project would not be substantial in the context of job growth in the City of Redding and the region. Although some of the employees generated by the proposed project may decide to live in Redding (or other adjacent unincorporated areas of Shasta County), the migration of these employees into the City is not anticipated to be at a level that would encourage or facilitate economic effects that could result in other activities (such as demand for increased residential and commercial development) that could significantly affect the environment.

PROMOTE PREMATURE OR LEAP-FROG DEVELOPMENT

Significant growth can occur if a new project is located in an isolated area and when developed it brings sufficient urban infrastructure to cause new or additional development pressure on the intervening and surrounding land. This type of induced growth leads to conversion of adjacent acreage to higher intensity uses, either unexpectedly or through accelerated development. This conversion occurs because the adjacent land becomes more suitable for development and, hence, more valuable because of the availability of the new infrastructure. This type of growth inducement is typically termed “leap frog” or “premature” development because it creates an island of higher intensity development land within a larger area of lower intensity land use.

The project site is bounded on the west by the Henderson Open Space area, with the Sacramento River further to the west; on the east by Hartnell Avenue; on the north by the Cypress Avenue bridge; and on the south by the Cobblestone Shopping Center, south of Parkview Avenue. Office and commercial uses are located across Cypress Avenue and Hartnell Avenue, respectively, and therefore would be contiguous to existing and future development in the area. All utilities needed to serve the proposed project have been previously planned for and would be extended from Hartnell Avenue without impacting overall system capacities. Given this physical context, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the urbanization of land in an isolated locality and would not be considered growth-inducing based on this criterion.

Access to the proposed project is currently provided via existing transportation infrastructure, including Cypress Avenue and Hartnell Avenue. Primary site access would be provided by existing local roads including two access points off Hartnell Avenue via Henderson Road (North) and Parkview Avenue (South).

Based on the above discussion, the proposed project is considered consistent with the *General Plan*, related to the *General Plan's* call for orderly growth, in that it would result in a contiguous development pattern within the City's corporate boundaries, is served by existing transportation and utility infrastructure, and would not result in a “leap-frog” or “premature” type of development.

PRECEDENT SETTING ACTION

Approval of the proposed project would require approval of a use permit, parcel map, general plan amendment, and zone change. A general plan amendment would change the land use classification of the project site from “General Office” (GO), “General Commercial” (GC), and “Greenway” (GWY), and is

zoned "General Office" (GO), "General Commercial" (GC), and "Open Space" (OS) to "Public Facilities" (PF-I). The zone change would revise the existing zoning from "General Office" (GO) and "General Commercial" (GC) to "Public Facilities" (PF). The proposed general plan amendment and zone change would not be considered precedent setting in that the City already anticipates non-residential urban development for the site, a property that can be served by existing utilities and services without the need for an expansion of infrastructure. Consequently, the proposed project would not be considered growth-inducing.

CONCLUSION

Based on the evaluation provided above, the proposed project is not considered to be significantly or adversely growth inducing; rather it is considered to be growth accommodating. The proposed project would not be developed at an intensity greater than that contained in both regional planning documents and local growth forecasts and does not include infrastructure designed to support more intensive uses of land than is provided for within the City's *General Plan*. The proposed project would foster economic growth but not require increased public services that would significantly affect the environment. Development within the project area would be responding to growth that was previously planned, rather than creating growth that would require substantial development of unplanned and unforeseen support uses and services. The location of future growth within Redding, the cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake, and in unincorporated Shasta County would continue to be controlled by the City and County as guided by their adopted general plans. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in significant or adverse growth-inducing impacts.