

2.12 Population and Housing

This section identifies existing population and housing within the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area, and analyzes the potential effects of the Proposed Project on these conditions. Population and housing impacts associated with the Proposed Project are tabulated at the PSR Analysis Area and the former CGSP Area level, combined with local data (CPA/Subregion), and compared to regional (County) and State data. Since the adoption of the General Plan, updated U.S. Census Bureau data and SANDAG population estimates and forecasts have been published, and are used for the analysis of Proposed Project impacts in this section.

A summary of the population and housing impacts identified in Section 2.12.3 is provided below.

Population and Housing Resources Summary of Impacts

Issue Topic	Project Direct Impact	Cumulative Impact	Impact After Mitigation
Population Growth	Less than significant	Potentially significant	Significant and unavoidable
Displacement of Housing	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant
Displacement of People	Less than significant	Less than significant	Less than significant

2.12.1 Existing Conditions

Section 2.12.1 of the 2011 PEIR included a discussion of existing conditions related to population and housing in the unincorporated County. The population and housing data conditions described in the 2011 PEIR have been updated below with recent data that is now available. While the data has been updated, the changes do not alter the conclusions from the 2011 PEIR. All references used from the 2011 PEIR were reviewed, and are hereby incorporated by reference.

2.12.1.1 *Population Trends*

Population in the unincorporated portions of the County has experienced growth since the certification of the 2011 PEIR. As discussed in Chapter 1 (Project Description) of this SEIR, there are 21 consolidated PSR Analysis Areas located in nine CPAs or Subregions within the unincorporated County, in addition to 8 Subareas of the former CGSP Area. The analysis for dwelling unit and population increases associated with former CGSP Subareas CG1, CG6, CG7, and CG8 are included in the Bonsall CPA discussion, former CGSP Subarea CG5 is included in the North County Metro CPA discussion, and former CGSP Subareas CG2, CG3, and CG4 are included in the Valley Center CPA discussion.

Population Growth

Between 2000 and 2010 the population in the CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area were estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau to have increased 26 percent, from 139,978 to 175,860. The 2010 population represents approximately 6 percent of the total County population. The growth rate of 26 percent in CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas is higher than the countywide growth rate of 10 percent (SANDAG 2003, 2015b).

Table 2.12-1 shows population for each CPA/Subregion containing PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area. In 2010, the affected CPAs/Subregions with the highest populations include Fallbrook (43,338 people), North County Metro (43,103 people), and San Dieguito (30,031 people). The CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas supporting the highest percent population increase from 2000 to 2010 included San Dieguito (140 percent), Mountain Empire (50 percent), and Desert (35 percent). CPAs/Subregions containing the lowest populations in 2010 included Desert (4,402 people), Pala-Pauma (6,135 people), and Mountain Empire (9,627 people) (SANDAG 2003, 2015b).

Forecasted Population

Table 2.12-1 also shows the forecasted population in the CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas at 15-year increments from 2020 to 2050. SANDAG forecasts the population in the CPAs/Subregions containing the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area will increase to approximately 232,786 people by 2035 (a 32 percent increase from 2010) and 243,426 by 2050 (a 38 percent increase from 2010). CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas likely to experience the most growth (total population and percent) between 2010 and 2050 include Desert (2,920 people, 66 percent), Valley Center (8,569 people, 45 percent), North County Metro (22,207 people, 52 percent), Pala-Pauma (2,923 people, 48 percent), and Bonsall (4,184 people, 40 percent). The Crest-Dehesa CPA is forecasted to have limited growth (1,274 people, 13 percent) between 2010 and 2050 (SANDAG 2013).

2.12.1.2 Household Profile

Household Type and Size

There are two types of households: family and non-family. Family households generally include married couples with and without children and non-family households generally describe single-person households, including elderly persons, and multi-person households not related by birth, marriage, or adoption. Table 2.12-2 shows that the CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas had 67,067 households in 2015, representing a 26 percent increase from 2000 (SANDAG 2017b). As shown in Table 2.12-3, based on the 2010 U.S. Census and the SANDAG Housing Forecast, the CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas and former CGSP Area are forecasted to have 73,036 households by 2020, 79,905 by 2030, and 89,295 by 2050 (SANDAG 2017b; These are increases of approximately 9 percent, 12 percent, and 36 percent (SANDAG 2013, 2015b). Cumulative data for the CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area regarding household type is unavailable; however, as shown in Table 2.12-4, the vast majority of households in individual PSR Analysis Areas and former CGSP Area in 2015 were single families (SANDAG 2017b). Table 2.12-4 shows in 2015 the average household size in the affected CPAs/Subregions was 2.83, which is the same as the rest of the unincorporated part of San Diego County (SANDAG 2017b). The 2015 average is lower than the 2000 average of 2.88 people per household (SANDAG 2017b). This decrease in average household size is related to the increase of single person households and elderly persons living alone.

Household Tenure and Occupancy

Tenure refers to the type of occupancy, whether a unit is owner-occupied or renter-occupied, and a household refers to any occupied housing unit. The tenure split of the occupied units is primarily owner-occupied (77 percent in 2010), as shown in Table 2.12-5. In comparison, the entire unincorporated area in San Diego had 68 percent owner-occupancy (SANDAG 2015b).

In most cases, the tenure split in individual CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas reflects the composition of the housing stock. CPAs/Subregions with high proportions of single-family homes have high proportions of owner-occupants. CPAs/Subregions containing high proportions of multi-family housing and mobile homes have high proportions of renter-occupants. Accordingly, Fallbrook CPA has a renter occupied rate of 32 percent and 17 percent of housing units are classified as multi-family; both are the highest percentages among CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas. The Crest-Dehesa CPA has the highest percentage of single-family homes (91 percent) and owner-occupied homes (87 percent) (SANDAG 2015b).

2.12.1.3 Housing Profile

The U.S. Census Bureau defines a housing unit as a house, apartment, mobile home, group of rooms, or single room that is occupied (or if vacant, is intended for occupancy) as a separate living quarter. Separate living quarters are those in which the occupants live separately from any other individuals in the building and have direct access from outside the building or through a common hall.

Table 2.12-4 shows most housing units in the CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area are single-family homes (79 percent), which is a higher percentage than for the region as a whole. Multi-family homes represent 7 percent of the housing stock, which is about one-fifth of the regional proportion. Mobile homes and other housing types represent 7 percent of the housing stock in CPAs/Subregions containing the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area, which is nearly double that of the regional proportion. According to 2015 SANDAG data, 4,695 mobile homes and other housing types are located in CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area. SANDAG defines a mobile home or other home as mobile homes in mobile home parks, boats, and other housing not elsewhere classified (SANDAG 2015b).

Due to differences in community character, as well as unique constraints and opportunities, several CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area have higher proportions of multi-family housing compared to other parts of the unincorporated County. The Desert Subregion has a significantly higher proportion of mobile homes and other housing types (23 percent) than the other CPAs/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas. The other CPA/Subregions containing PSR Analysis Areas range between 5 and 7 percent, except for San Dieguito CPA (0 percent) and Crest-Dehesa CPA (3 percent), for mobile homes and other housing types (SANDAG 2017b).

Between 2000 and 2010, housing stock in the CPAs/Subregions containing the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area increased by 23 percent, almost double the San Diego region as a whole (Table 2.12-2). Based on SANDAG forecasts, growth in housing stock in the CPAs/Subregions containing the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area is expected to slow, comparatively, between 2010 and 2020, with an anticipated 11 percent increase, higher than the forecasted 8 percent increase for the region during the same period. The housing stock growth in the affected CPAs/Subregions is also forecast to be higher than the region through the year 2050 (SANDAG 2015b).

2.12.2 Regulatory Framework

Section 2.12.2 of the 2011 PEIR included a discussion of regulatory framework related to population and housing in the unincorporated County. The regulations described in the 2011

PEIR are the same as the regulations evaluated in this SEIR, with the exception of an update of the State Housing Law Element. No changes to the regulations have been identified that would alter the conclusions from the 2011 PEIR. All references used from in the 2011 PEIR were reviewed to ensure they are still valid today, and are hereby incorporated by reference.

State Housing Element Law

The State Housing Element Update was adopted by the County BOS on April 24, 2013. Changes were limited to the Background Report which has been updated with recent demographic data and analyses and addresses the County's ability to meet new State Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) goals through the County Sites Inventory.

The County RHNA is 22,412 residential units for the 2010-2020 Housing Element Cycle. The units are distributed by income categories as follows:

- Extremely Low-Income (1,042 units)
- Very Low-Income (1,043 units)
- Low-Income (1,585 units)
- Moderate-Income (5,864 units)
- Above Moderate-Income (12,878 units)

The County must ensure the availability of residential sites at adequate densities and appropriate development standards to accommodate these units.

2.12.3 Analysis of Project Impacts and Determination of Significance

2.12.3.1 Issue 1: Population Growth

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the Proposed Project would be considered to have a significant impact if it would 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).

Impact Analysis

The Proposed Project would allow increases in residential development densities in the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area beyond the land use densities analyzed in the 2011 PEIR. Future development associated with land uses allowed under the Proposed Project would result in potential physical impacts on the environment, including but not limited to impacts to biological resources, air quality, water supply, noise, or traffic. The environmental impacts of this growth are analyzed in the other issue topics throughout Chapter 2 of this SEIR.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in an increase of up to 1,826 potential dwelling units and an associated estimated population increase of 4,946. The potential population increase is determined to be the average household size multiplied by the potential increase in dwelling units. As shown in Table 2.12-6, the increase in potential dwelling units and persons per CPA/Subregions are as follows: Bonsall (74 dwelling units, 205 people), Crest-Dehesa (7 dwelling units, 20 people), Desert (542 dwelling units, 1,171 people), Fallbrook (57 dwelling units, 165 people), Mountain Empire (55 dwelling units, 155 people), North County Metro (152 dwelling units, 424 people), Pala-Pauma (122 dwelling units, 405 people), San

Dieguito (301 dwelling units, 894 people), and Valley Center (516 dwelling units, 1,507 people). This growth is not directly accounted for within an adopted land use planning document; however, regional planning documents anticipate population growth within the San Diego region, and the growth associated with the Proposed Project would not be considered substantial if it is in line with the population forecasts used within regional planning documents. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2 states that “it must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.”

The State Housing Element Law, CGC Section 65580, requires that the Housing Element of a General Plan contain local commitments to provide sites with appropriate zoning and development standards and with services and facilities to accommodate the jurisdiction’s RHNA for each income level. The RHNA is the only population and/or housing requirement that applies to the General Plan.

As shown in Table 2.12-1 and Table 2.12-6, the potential 205 person increase in the Bonsall CPA from the Proposed Project would amount to a 2 percent increase to 2015 population estimates; however, the Bonsall CPA is projected to grow 14 percent between 2010 and 2020. Therefore, the growth associated with the Proposed Project in the Bonsall CPA would not be considered substantial in the context of planned regional growth.

The potential 20 person increase in Crest-Dehesa CPA would amount to a less than 1 percent increase to 2015 population estimates; however, the Crest-Dehesa CPA is projected to grow 9 percent between 2010 and 2020. Therefore, the growth associated with the Proposed Project in the Crest-Dehesa CPA would not be considered substantial in the context of planned regional growth.

The potential 1,171 person increase in Desert Subregion would amount to a 20 percent increase to 2015 population estimates; however, the Desert Subregion is projected to grow 18 percent between 2010 and 2020. Additionally, the Desert Subregion is projected to grow an additional 20 percent between 2020 and 2035, and 17 percent between 2035 and 2050. From 2010 to 2050, the population in the Desert Subregion is anticipated to grow a total of 66 percent (Table 2.12-1). Therefore, the growth associated with the Proposed Project in the Desert Subregion would not be considered substantial in the context of planned regional growth.

The potential 165 person increase in the Fallbrook CPA would amount to a 1 percent increase to 2015 population estimates; however, the Fallbrook CPA is projected to grow 13 percent between 2010 and 2020. Therefore, the growth associated with the Proposed Project in the Fallbrook CPA would not be considered substantial in the context of planned regional growth.

The potential 155 person increase in the Mountain Empire CPA would amount to a 2 percent increase to 2015 population estimates and the population for the Mountain Empire CPA is projected to decrease by 8 percent between 2010 and 2020. However, from 2020 to 2035 and 2035 to 2050, the Mountain Empire Subregion is anticipated to grow 20 and 13 percent, respectively. It should be noted that the Mountain Empire CPA is projected to grow 25 percent between 2010 and 2050. Therefore, the growth associated with the Proposed Project in the Mountain Empire CPA would not be considered substantial in the context of planned regional growth.

The potential 424 person increase in the North County Metro CPA would amount to a 1 percent increase in population to 2015 population estimates; however, the North County Metro CPA is projected to grow 14 percent between 2010 and 2020. Therefore, the growth associated with the Proposed Project in the North County Metro CPA would not be considered substantial in the context of planned regional growth.

The potential 405 person increase in the Pala-Pauma CPA would amount to a 7 percent increase to 2015 population estimates; however, the Pala-Pauma CPA is projected to grow 22 percent between 2010 and 2020. Therefore, the growth associated with the Proposed Project in the Pala-Pauma CPA would not be considered substantial in the context of planned regional growth.

The potential 894 person increase in San Dieguito CPA would amount to a 3 percent increase to 2015 population estimates; however, the San Dieguito CPA is projected to grow 13 percent between 2010 and 2020. Therefore, the growth associated with the Proposed Project in the San Dieguito CPA would not be considered substantial in the context of planned regional growth.

The potential 1,507 person increase to the Valley Center CPA would amount to an 8 percent increase to 2015 population estimates; however, the Valley Center CPA is projected to grow 20 percent between 2010 and 2020. Therefore, the growth associated with the Proposed Project in the Valley Center CPA would not be considered substantial in the context of planned regional growth.

Overall, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact, because it would not directly result in substantial population growth that is inconsistent with forecasted regional population estimates. The Proposed Project would not result in indirect population growth, as it does not include plans for construction or extension of roads or other infrastructure which would encourage increased population. The Proposed Project would add or increase the number of dwelling units within the CPA/Subregions containing the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area, which would accommodate the additional population growth forecasted by SANDAG within these areas. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in indirect population growth.

Adoption of the Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would allow for additional minimum lot size flexibility for residential clustering only within SR-2 or SR-4 areas and only within the sewer service area; however, the adoption would not result in an increase in the number of allowed dwelling units. Therefore, implementation of Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would not result in an impact associated with substantial population growth.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact as it would not directly or indirectly result in substantial population growth that is inconsistent with forecasted regional population estimates.

2.12.3.2 Issue 2: Displacement of Housing

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the Proposed Project would have a significant impact if it would displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Impact Analysis

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not directly result in the removal or demolition of any existing residences or other structures currently located within a PSR Analysis Area or the former CGSP Area. The Proposed Project would result in an increase in the total number of dwelling units allowed in each of the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area, except VC67, as discussed below. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would not result

in the displacement of substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

It should be noted that the Proposed Project would result in two PSR Analysis Areas converting residential land use to some non-residential land use; however, the properties do not currently contain residences. PSR Analysis Area SD15 in the San Dieguito CPA would convert a 19-acre portion of the Analysis Area currently designated as Semi-Rural 1 (SR-1) to General Commercial; however, the General Commercial portion is proposed for mixed use zoning that would still allow residential. PSR Analysis Area VC67 in the Valley Center CPA would convert the entire Analysis Area, currently designated as Semi-Rural 2 (SR-2) to Medium Impact Industrial (I-2). In addition, former CGSP Subareas CG6 and CG8 include proposals for Rural Commercial on undeveloped portions of these areas totaling 6 acres. Therefore, the potential effects on displacement of housing resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.

Adoption of the Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would allow for additional minimum lot size flexibility for residential clustering only within SR-2 or SR-4 areas and only within the sewer service area; however, the adoption would not result in an increase in the number of allowed dwelling units; and would not directly result in the displacement of housing units. Therefore, implementation of Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would not result in an impact associated with the displacement of housing.

2.12.3.3 Issue 3: Displacement of People

Guidelines for Determination of Significance

Based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the Proposed Project would be considered to have a significant impact if it would displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Impact Analysis

The Proposed Project would allow for an increase in the total number of dwelling units in each of the PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area, except VC67. However, the Proposed Project would not directly result in the removal or demolition of any existing housing currently located within a PSR Analysis Area or the former CGSP Area. The existing people currently residing in PSR Analysis Areas and the former CGSP Area would not be required to relocate as a result of the Proposed Project. The General Plan Land Use Map provides adequate capacity to exceed its RHNA of 22,412 residential units. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, and impacts would be less than significant.

Adoption of the Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would allow for additional minimum lot size flexibility for residential clustering only within SR-2 or SR-4 areas and only within the sewer service area; however, the adoption would not result in an increase in the number of allowed dwelling units or the displacement of homes or people. Therefore, implementation of Valley Center Community Plan Residential Policy 8 Revision would not result in an impact associated with the displacement of people.

2.12.4 Cumulative Impacts

The geographic scope for the population and housing cumulative analysis includes the entire County, including both incorporated and unincorporated areas, and surrounding counties, unless otherwise stated below. The cumulative impact analysis study area for population and housing in the 2011 PEIR was identified as the entire County, including incorporated cities, and the surrounding counties of Riverside, Orange, and Imperial. Section 1.11 (Cumulative Project Assessment Overview) of this SEIR provides an update of new projects since the adoption of the General Plan that are considered in this cumulative analysis.

2.12.4.1 Issue 1: Population Growth

The cumulative projects in the San Diego region would potentially result in a significant cumulative impact if they would result in a substantial direct or indirect increase in population growth. The County General Plan and general plans of adjacent jurisdictions are used to develop the population forecast of regional planning documents, such as the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. As such, projects consistent with these planning documents would accommodate anticipated future growth and not induce new growth. Some cumulative projects, such as the Sugarbush project located in the North County Metro Subregion which proposes 45 dwelling units, would be consistent with the adopted General Plan and forecasted regional growth assumptions. However, other private projects, such as those identified in Tables 1-10 to 1-14, that propose residential development above the number of dwelling units allowed under the adopted General Plan would have the potential to induce population growth. For example, Lilac Hills Ranch in the Valley Center/Bonsall CPAs proposes 1,746 dwelling units, far in excess of the 110 dwelling units that are allowed currently by the existing land use designations. Similar to the Proposed Project, these projects would require approval of a General Plan Amendment. However, when considering the combined effect of cumulative projects requiring a General Plan Amendment for an increase in dwelling units, a significant increase in population growth would occur that has not been accounted for in the adopted General Plan or regional plans. **Cumulative projects would result in a potentially significant impact related to a substantial increase in population growth in the San Diego region.**

As discussed above, implementation of the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact to an increase in population growth, because it would not directly result in substantial population growth that is inconsistent with forecasted regional population estimates. **However, the Proposed Project, in combination with other cumulative projects, including development projects that require a General Plan Amendment to increase the allowable number of dwelling units, would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a regionally significant impact associated with substantial increases in population growth (Impact PH-1).**

2.12.4.2 Issue 2: Displacement of Housing

The cumulative projects in the San Diego region would potentially result in a cumulative impact if a substantial amount of housing would be displaced that would necessitate replacement housing elsewhere. The general plans and other planning documents prepared by the adjacent jurisdictions would be required to supply their share of the regional housing needs, and these planning documents would require a land use plan allowing for the development of adequate new housing and/or replacing displaced housing. Displaced housing would rarely occur outside its jurisdiction and would not result in a cumulative impact. The majority of residential cumulative

projects, such as those identified in Tables 1-10 to 1-14, would increase the number of dwelling units within their individual project areas. For example, Lilac Hills Ranch in the Valley Center/Bonsall CPAs proposes an additional 1,746 dwelling units over the 110 dwelling units allowed currently by the existing land use designations. Displacement of housing could potentially occur from implementation of some cumulative projects at least on a temporary basis; however, overall the cumulative projects would result in a net increase in housing. Therefore, cumulative projects would not result in a significant impact with regard to displacement of housing. The Proposed Project, in combination with the identified cumulative projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

2.12.4.3 Issue 3: Displacement of People

The cumulative projects in the San Diego region would have the potential to result in a cumulative impact if a substantial number of people would be displaced and would necessitate replacement housing elsewhere. If a substantial amount of housing would be displaced as a result of cumulative projects, a substantial number of people would be displaced. The general plans and other planning documents prepared by the adjacent jurisdictions would be required to develop a land use plan that would accommodate the existing and forecasted population. Consistent with State law, these planning documents would be required to include a land use plan providing adequate housing to accommodate forecasted numbers of people within the jurisdiction, and/or replacing displaced development primarily within the jurisdiction to alleviate the need for housing outside of the jurisdiction. Displacement of people would potentially occur from implementation of some cumulative projects at least on a temporary basis; however, overall the cumulative projects would result in a net increase in housing, thus not resulting in a significant impact. As a condition of approval, private development projects, such as those identified in Tables 1-10 to 1-14 would be required to comply with the applicable land use plans governing the project site. Because cumulative projects would comply with all applicable land use plans to provide adequate development within a jurisdiction, a significant cumulative impact would not occur. Therefore, the Proposed Project, in combination with the identified cumulative projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.

2.12.5 Mitigation

2.12.5.1 Issue 1: Population Growth

The Proposed Project would result in a potentially significant cumulative impact related to population growth. The following adopted General Plan policies would reduce cumulative **Impact PH-1** but **not to a level below significant; therefore, the cumulative impact would remain significant and unavoidable.**

Adopted General Plan Policies

Policy LU-1.4: Village Expansion. Permit new village Regional Category designated land uses only where contiguous with existing or planned Village and where all of the following criteria are met:

- Potential Village development would be compatible with environmental conditions and constraints, such as topography and flooding.
- Potential Village development would be accommodated by the General Plan road network.

- Public facilities and services can support the expansion without a reduction of services to other County residents.
- The expansion is consistent with community character, the scale, and the orderly and contiguous growth of a Village area

Policy LU-9.4: Infrastructure Serving Villages and Community Cores. Prioritize infrastructure improvements and the provision of public facilities for Villages and community cores as sized for the intensity of development allowed by the Land Use Map.

Policy LU-14.4: Sewer Facilities. Prohibit sewer facilities that would induce unplanned growth. Require sewer systems to be planned, developed, and sized to serve the land use pattern and densities depicted on the Land Use Map. Sewer systems and services shall not be extended beyond either Village boundaries or extent Urban Limit Lines, whichever is more restrictive, except:

- When necessary for public health, safety or welfare;
- When within existing sewer district boundaries;
- When necessary for a conservation subdivision adjacent to existing sewer facilities; or
- Where specifically allowed in the Community Plan.

Mitigation Measure

M-Pop-1.1: The County of San Diego shall provide to SANDAG a revised population, employment, and housing forecast that reflects the anticipated growth generated from the Proposed Project.

2.12.5.2 Issue 2: Displacement of Housing

The Proposed Project would not result in significant direct and cumulative impacts related to the displacement of housing; therefore, mitigation is not necessary. However, the following adopted General Plan policies would continue to apply.

Policy H-4.1: Rehabilitation and Revitalization Strategies. Promote and support rehabilitation and revitalization strategies aimed at preserving the existing supply of affordable housing.

Policy H-4.2: Redevelopment of Deteriorated Housing. Encourage and support residential redevelopment in areas characterized by deteriorated housing.

2.12.5.3 Issue 3: Displacement of People

The Proposed Project would not result in significant direct and cumulative impacts related to the displacement of people; therefore, mitigation is not necessary.

2.12.6 Conclusion

The discussion below provides a synopsis of the conclusion reached in each of the above impact analyses, and the level of impact that would remain after mitigation measures are implemented.

2.12.6.1 Issue 1: Population Growth

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned population growth and would not result in a potentially significant direct impact. The Proposed Project in combination with other cumulative projects, including development projects that require a General Plan Amendment to increase the allowable number of dwelling units, would have a cumulatively considerable contribution to a regionally significant impact associated with substantial increases in population growth (Impact PH-1). **Although mitigation measure M-Pop-1.1 and adopted General Plan Policies LU-1.4, LU-9.4, and LU-14.4 would be applicable and reduce cumulative impacts associated with population growth, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable (Impact PH-1).**

2.12.6.2 Issue 2: Displacement of Housing

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not displace a substantial amount of housing, and would not result in a significant impact. In addition, the Proposed Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with displacement of housing.

2.12.6.3 Issue 3: Displacement of People

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not displace a substantial number of people, and would result not in a significant impact. In addition, the Proposed Project would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact associated with displacement of people.

Table 2.12-1 2000-2010 Census and Projected Population 2050

CPA/Subregion	Census		Population Projection (SANDAG) ⁽³⁾			Percent Change				
	2000 ⁽¹⁾	2010 ⁽²⁾	2020	2035	2050	2000-10	2010-20	2020-35	2035-50	2010-50
Bonsall	8,880	10,379	11,876	14,393	14,563	17%	14%	21%	1%	40%
Crest-Dehesa	9,365	9,788	10,680	11,049	11,062	5%	9%	4%	0%	13%
Desert	3,262	4,402	5,187	6,242	7,322	35%	18%	20%	17%	66%
Fallbrook	39,599	43,338	48,924	56,011	57,505	10%	13%	15%	3%	33%
Mountain Empire	6,402	9,627	8,842	10,596	11,997	50%	-8%	20%	13%	25%
North County Metro	38,253	43,103	49,233	62,000	65,310	13%	14%	26%	5%	52%
Pala-Pauma	6,176	6,135	7,510	8,776	9,058	-1%	22%	17%	3%	48%
San Dieguito	12,516	30,031	33,885	38,171	38,983	140%	13%	13%	2%	30%
Valley Center	15,525	19,057	22,839	25,548	27,626	23%	20%	12%	8%	45%
Total:	139,978	175,860	198,976	232,786	243,426	26%	13%	17%	5%	38%
San Diego County	2,813,833	3,095,313	3,435,713	3,853,698	4,068,759	10%	11%	12%	6%	32%

⁽¹⁾ Source: SANDAG 2003. 2000 Census Estimates

⁽²⁾ Source: SANDAG 2015b. 2010 Census Estimates

⁽³⁾ Source: SANDAG 2013. Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast

Table 2.12-2 Housing Trends 2000-2015

CPA/Subregion	Housing Units			Percent Change	
	2000 ⁽¹⁾	2010 ⁽²⁾	2015 ⁽³⁾	2000-2010	2010-2015
Bonsall	3,367	3,875	3,933	15%	2%
Crest-Dehesa	3,333	3,562	3,615	7%	2%
Desert	2,887	3,546	3,596	23%	1%
Fallbrook	14,046	15,929	16,285	13%	2%
Mountain Empire	2,632	3,023	3,060	15%	1%
North County Metro	14,388	16,114	16,092	12%	0%
Pala-Pauma	2,071	1,980	1,933	-4%	-2%
San Dieguito	5,025	10,993	11,812	119%	8%
Valley Center	5,529	6,638	6,741	20%	2%
Total:	53,278	65,660	67,067	23%	2%
San Diego County	1,040,149	1,158,076	1,183,211	11%	2%

⁽¹⁾ Source: SANDAG 2003. 2000 Census Estimates

⁽²⁾ Source: SANDAG 2015b. 2010 Census Estimates

⁽³⁾ Source: SANDAG 2017b. 2015 Estimates

Table 2.12-3 2010 Census and Projected Housing Units 2050

CPA/Subregion	Housing Units				Percent Change			
	2010	2020	2030	2050	2010-2020	2020-2030	2030-2050	2010-2050
Bonsall	3,875	4,320	4,884	5,328	12%	13%	9%	38%
Crest-Dehesa	3,562	3,806	3,838	3,932	7%	1%	2%	10%
Desert	3,546	3,726	3,952	5,117	5%	6%	30%	44%
Fallbrook	15,929	17,554	18,648	20,584	10%	6%	10%	29%
Mountain Empire	3,023	3,171	3,703	4,329	5%	17%	17%	43%
North County Metro	16,114	18,100	20,955	23,555	12%	16%	12%	46%
Pala-Pauma	1,980	2,366	2,517	2,865	20%	6%	14%	45%
San Dieguito	10,993	12,163	13,065	14,047	11%	7%	8%	28%
Valley Center	6,638	7,830	8,343	9,538	18%	7%	14%	44%
Total:	65,660	73,036	79,905	89,295	11%	9%	12%	36%
San Diego County	1,158,076	1,249,684	1,348,802	1,491,935	8%	8%	11%	29%

Source: SANDAG 2015b. 2010 Census Estimates ; SANDAG 2013. Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast

Table 2.12-4 Housing Type 2015

CPA/Subregion	Total Units	Percent Single-Family	Percent Multiple-Unit Single Family	Percent Multi-Family	Percent Mobile Homes & Other	Persons per Household	Vacancy Rate
Bonsall	3,933	79%	8%	8%	5%	2.77	5%
Crest-Dehesa	3,615	91%	3%	3%	3%	2.85	3%
Desert	3,596	61%	10%	6%	23%	2.16	31%
Fallbrook	16,285	73%	5%	17%	5%	2.89	5%
Mountain Empire	3,060	85%	2%	6%	7%	2.82	4%
North County Metro	16,092	81%	6%	7%	6%	2.79	6%
Pala-Pauma	1,933	79%	13%	1%	7%	3.32	5%
San Dieguito	11,812	72%	11%	17%	0%	2.97	6%
Valley Center	6,741	89%	3%	0%	7%	2.92	3%
Combined Total/Rate:	67,067	79%	7%	7%	7%	2.86	7%
San Diego County	1,183,211	47%	13%	36%	4%	2.86	5%

Source: SANDAG 2017b. 2015 Estimates

Table 2.12-5 Housing Tenure 2010

CPU/Subregion	Total Housing Units	Occupied Units	Percent Owner Occupied	Percent Renter Occupied
Bonsall	3,875	3,705	77%	23%
Crest-Dehesa	3,562	3,446	87%	13%
Desert	3,546	1,997	79%	21%
Fallbrook	15,929	15,029	68%	32%
Mountain Empire	3,023	2,739	70%	30%
North County Metro	16,114	15,091	79%	21%
Pala-Pauma	1,980	1,845	71%	29%
San Dieguito	10,993	10,089	83%	17%
Valley Center	6,638	6,511	80%	20%
Combined Total/Rate:	65,660	60,452	77%	23%

Source: SANDAG 2017b. 2015 Estimates

Table 2.12-6 Population and Housing Increase

CPA/Subregion	Estimated Increase in Potential Dwelling Units	Average Persons Per Household⁽¹⁾	Increase in Population	Estimated 2015 Population	Percent Increase
Bonsall	74	2.77	205	10,518	2%
Crest-Dehesa	7	2.85	20	10,038	<1%
Desert	542	2.16	1,171	5,969	20%
Fallbrook	57	2.89	165	45,249	<1%
Mountain Empire	55	2.82	155	8,607	2%
North County Metro	152	2.79	424	42,926	1%
Pala-Pauma	122	3.32	405	6,141	7%
San Dieguito	301	2.97	894	32,995	3%
Valley Center	516	2.92	1,507	19,287	8%
Total:	1,826		4,946	181,730	3%

Source: SANDAG 2017b. 2015 Estimates

This page intentionally left blank.