
IV. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

K. POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Population and housing data and forecasts are compiled by number of agencies, including the U.S. Census, Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the City of Los Angeles.

Project Site

The project site is currently developed as a golf course and the only structures are those associated with such a use. Therefore, the project site does not contain any housing or residents.

Census Tracts

The project site is located within Census Tract 1014.00. The 2000 U.S. Census only provides population and housing estimates for 2000; it does not project employment levels nor does it project population and housing estimates for the years following 2000. As shown in Table IV.K-1, Census Tract 1014.00 had a total population of 3,760 and 1,454 housing units

Table IV.K-1
2000 Census Tract Population and Housing Data

Tract	Population	Housing
1014. 00 ^a	3,760	1,454
<i>Sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, SF3, Tables P1 and H1.</i>		

Sunland--Tujunga-Shadow Hills-Lakeview Terrace-East La Tuna Canyon Community

The project site is located within the Sunland--Tujunga-Shadow Hills-Lakeview Terrace-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan (Community Plan) area of the City, which encompasses 26 square miles and is one of the least densely populated areas in the City, with approximately 44 percent of the land dedicated to single-family homes and approximately three percent dedicated to multi-family homes.¹ According to the U.S. Census, the Community Plan area had a population of 58,228 in 2000. In 2000, the U.S. Census counted 20,573 housing units in the Community Plan area.² The most recent estimates provided by the

¹ City of Los Angeles, *1998 Annual Report on Growth and Infrastructure*, www.cityofla.org/PLN/DRU/HomeSpcl.htm, April 4, 2003.

² City of Los Angeles, "City of Los Angeles Population & Housing Estimates, Summary Data by Community Plan Area", <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/DRU/Locl/LocPfl.cfm?&geo=CP&loc=Sld&yrx=06>, June 5, 2008

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning Demographics Research Unit are for 2006.³ As indicated in Table IV.K-2, the population increased by 4,222 people (slightly greater than one percent) and the housing inventory increased by 222 units (less than one percent)

Table IV.K-2
Community Plan Area
2000 and 2006 Census Population and Housing Data

Year	Population	Housing
2000	58,228	20,573
2006	62,450	20,945
Growth	1.08%	0.28%

Source: City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning Demographics Research Unit, "City of Los Angeles Population & Housing Estimates, Summary Data by Community Plan Area", June 5, 2008

<http://cityplanning.lacity.org/DRU/LocL/LocPfl.cfm?&geo=CP&loc=Sld&yxr=06>

The City includes SCAG data in its community plans, including the Sunland-Tujunga-Shadow Hills-Lakeview Terrace-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan, to help guide land use goals and policies. SCAG projects future population and housing growth in Southern California through the year 2035 as part of its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Table IV.K-3 presents population and housing forecasts for the Community Plan.

Table IV.K-3
Community Plan
Population and Housing Forecasts

Year	Population	Housing
Community Plan Area		
2000	59,843	21,393
2010	69,032	25,365
Change	+9,189 (15.4%)	+3,972 (18.6%)
Citywide		
2000	3,852,993	1,323,882
2010	4,306,564	1,474,514
Change	+45,3571 (11.8%)	+150,632 (11.4%)

Source: City of Los Angeles, Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan, "Community Profile," 1997.

³ City of Los Angeles, "City of Los Angeles Population & Housing Estimates, Summary Data by Community Plan Area", <http://cityplanning.lacity.org/DRU/LocL/LocPfl.cfm?&geo=CP&loc=Sld&yxr=06>

The data in Table IV.K-3 indicates that population is expected to increase by 15.4 percent and housing is expected to increase by 18.6 percent between 2000 and 2010 in the Community Plan area. This compares to a projected citywide population increase of 11.8 percent and a projected housing increase of 11.4 percent for the same time period. Therefore, as indicated by this data, population and housing within the Community Plan area is expected to increase at a faster pace than is expected citywide.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with Appendix G to the CEQA Guidelines, a significant impact to population or housing would occur if the proposed project:

- Induces substantial population growth directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses), or indirectly, through extension of roads or other infrastructure; or
- Displaces substantial numbers of existing housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Project Impacts

Direct Growth

The proposed project includes construction of 229 single-family homes on a site currently developed with a golf course but no residential uses. The Community Plan indicates that approximately 2.52 persons are anticipated to occupy each unit within the Low Medium I density land use category in 2010.⁴ Based upon this factor, approximately 577 persons are anticipated to reside on the project site upon the completion of construction. As the project site is currently undeveloped, this increase in residential population represents a 100 percent population and housing increase on the project site. The direct physical impacts resulting from this increase in population growth are addressed throughout this Draft EIR (see Sections IV.A through IV.O). This population growth is not anticipated to be substantial. First, the proposed project includes the preservation of approximately 30 acres (over 50 percent) on the project site as permanent open space, which would prevent future development from occurring on that portion of the project site.

In addition, the proposed project includes the construction of only 229 single-family homes, a relatively small residential project that would be occupied by approximately 577 people, which on its face does not constitute substantial population growth. The projected population associated with the proposed project would also be consistent with area-wide population and housing forecasts. Specifically, the proposed

⁴ City of Los Angeles, *Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan, 1997, page III-2.*

project represents approximately six percent of the forecasted population growth and less than six percent of the forecasted housing growth in the Community Plan area (see Table IV.K-3).

The proposed project is also consistent with the projected housing in the Community Plan. The Community Plans permit 8 to 17 dwelling unit per net acre under the Low Medium I Density Residential land use designation, which is the existing land use designation for the approximately 28 acres of the project site to be developed with the residential units. The land use designations for the balance of the project site is Minimum Residential which permits 0 to 1 dwelling units per net acre. The housing projections in the Community Plans are based on the midpoint in the range of dwelling units permitted under each residential land use designation. For example, the projected housing in the Community Plans with respect to land with a Low Medium II Residential land use designation is based on 13.5 dwelling units per acre, the midpoint range of 8 to 17 dwelling units per net acre for that land use designation. The development of 229 townhouses would require approximately 17 net acres of land (based on a midpoint density of 13.5 units per acre). The Community Plans project approximately 393 homes (28 acres x 13.5 d.u/ac and 30 acres x .5 d.u/ac) on the project site. In contrast, the proposed project includes only 229 homes on the 58-acre project site, which translates to approximately 3.94 dwelling units per net acre ($229 \div 58$). Therefore, the proposed project is within the City's growth projections. As a result, development of the proposed project would not directly induce substantial population growth and impacts relating to population and housing would be less than significant.

Indirect Growth

The proposed project would extend roadways and other infrastructure (e.g., water facilities, sewer facilities, electricity transmission lines, natural gas lines, etc.) to and within the project site (see Sections IV.N (Transportation/Traffic), IV-L (Public Services), and IV-O (Utilities and Service Systems)). However, the proposed roadways and other infrastructure would not induce growth because they would only serve project residents. In addition, over 50 percent of the project site would be preserved as open space and would not be available for future development. As a result, development of the proposed project would not indirectly induce substantial population growth and impacts relating to population and housing would be less than significant.

Population or Housing Displacement

The project site does not currently contain any housing or people. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not displace housing or people and no impacts would occur.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in any impacts on population or housing. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Implementation of the proposed project in conjunction with the 28 related projects identified in Table III-D and shown in Figure III-1 in Section III (Related Projects) would contribute to population and housing growth in the project vicinity. As indicated in Table IV.K-4, the related projects would generate approximately 271 new permanent jobs. The related projects in combination with the equivalent of one permanent full-time job that would be generated by the proposed project would yield a total of approximately 272 jobs.⁵

Table IV.K-4
Employees Generated by Related Projects

Land Use ^a	Size	Employee Generation Rate (employees/sf)	Employees
Retail/Convenience Store	155,250sf	0.0014	217
Fast Food Restaurant	10,250 sf	0.004	41
Church	8,300 sf	0.00033	3
Office	2,888	0.0034	10
Single Family Homes	236 DU	N/A	0
Multiple Family Homes	245 DU	N/A	0
Total Employees			271
^a The 28 related projects are summarized among these land uses.			
Source: LAUSD School Facilities Fee Plan, March 2, 2000.			

The homes that would be developed with implementation of the proposed project in combination with the related projects would concurrently increase the resident population in the area. Table IV.K-5 summarizes the number of residential units and the population factors based on the underlying land use category for the site.

Table IV.K-5
Population Generated by Related Residential Projects

Land Use	Size	Person/Unit	Total
Single Family Homes ^a	236 DU	2.97	701
Multiple Family Homes ^a	235 DU	2.52	592
Multiple Family Homes ^b	10 DU	3.55	36
Total Persons			1,329
Sources:			
^a City of Los Angeles, <i>Sunland-Tujunga-Lake View Terrace-Shadow Hills-East La Tuna Canyon Community Plan</i> , 1997, page III-2.			
^b County of Los Angeles, <i>Housing Element 1998-2005</i> , 2001 Ch.3 – pg 9			

⁵ Please note that this estimate does not include part-time gardening, housekeeping and security employees.

The 236 single-family homes and 245 multiple family units that would be developed with the related projects in combination with the proposed project's 229 single-family homes would yield a total of approximately 1,906 (577 project +1,329 related projects) new residents. Furthermore, if it is conservatively assumed that each full-time employee that would be generated by the related projects in combination with the proposed project relocated to the Sunland-Tujunga area, the residential population would increase by approximately 272 households and 808 people.⁶ This would result in a cumulative population increase of 2,714 people (1,906 + 808).

The addition of 2,714 new people would be well within the Community Plan's forecasted increase of 9,189 people between 2000 and 2010. As shown on Table IV.K-2, population is generally expected to increase at a slightly slower rate than housing between the years 2000 and 2010 in the Sunland-Tujunga area. This suggests that housing would become available as the population increases. It is likely, however, that some of the 2,714 additional people would not chose to relocate in the Sunland-Tujunga area or are possibly residents of the area currently. Therefore, the estimated 2,714 people that would be directly and indirectly generated by the proposed project in combination with the related projects is considered to be a conservative estimate.

The related projects include commercial, recreational and residential land uses. Some of the related projects may include the extension of roads or infrastructure. However, it is expected that the roadways or other infrastructure associated with the related projects would only serve the applicable related project. Therefore, the related projects would not extend roads or other infrastructure into previously undeveloped areas that would be available for future development.

Based on the foregoing, the proposed project in combination with the related projects would not result in a significant impact on population or housing because:

- The number of people and homes that would be generated by the proposed project is relatively small when compared to population and housing forecasts;
- Roadways and other infrastructure are not anticipated to be extended into previously undeveloped areas that would be available for future development; and
- The proposed project would not result in or contribute to the displacement of housing or people.

Therefore, cumulative impacts on population and housing would be less than significant.

⁶ This assumes that each full-time employee would generate one household and that the population per household would be based on the more conservative estimate of 2.97 persons per dwelling unit.

MITIGATION MEASURES

Implementation of the proposed project alone and in conjunction with the related projects would not result in any impacts on population or housing. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION

The proposed project's impacts on population and housing would be less than significant.