



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT

## PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

New Single-Family Residence  
1229 Vista Superba Drive

The following Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
<b>Project Title/Common Name:</b>	New Single-Family Residence
<b>Project Location:</b>	1229 Vista Superba Drive, Glendale, Los Angeles County
<b>Project Description:</b>	The proposed project involves the construction of a new 1,175 square-foot, two-story single-family residence on an undeveloped 4,213 square-foot lot. The subject site has an average current slope exceeding 50%, which requires approval of a conditional use permit (CUP). The subject site has an average current slope of 77%. The project requires approval of variances for lot size and to allow one of the two parking spaces to not be directly accessible (accessed by a lift). The proposed project will also require approval from the design review board.
<b>Project Type:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Project <input type="checkbox"/> Public Project
<b>Project Applicant:</b>	Mehrdad Hemmati 6362 La Jolla Blvd. La Jolla, CA 92037 858-945-0896
<b>Findings:</b>	The Director of the Community Development Department, on <b>August 20, 2013</b> , after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Negative Declaration be prepared.
<b>Mitigation Measures:</b>	No mitigation measures are required.
<b>Attachments:</b>	Initial Study Checklist
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Roger Kiesel, Senior Planner City of Glendale, Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386

**This page left intentionally blank.**



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
DEPARTMENT

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

New Single-Family Residence  
1229 Vista Superba Drive

1.	<b>Project Title:</b> New Single-Family Residence
2.	<b>Lead Agency Name and Address:</b> City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	<b>Contact Person and Phone Number:</b> Roger Kiesel, Senior Planner Tel: (818) 937-8152 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	<b>Project Location:</b> 1229 Vista Superba Drive, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	<b>Project Sponsor's Name and Address:</b> Mehrdad Hemmati 6362 La Jolla Blvd. La Jolla, CA 92037
6.	<b>General Plan Designation:</b> Low Density Residential
7.	<b>Zoning:</b> R1R (Restricted Residential) Zone, Floor Area District III
8.	<b>Description of the Project:</b> (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary support or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)  The proposed project involves the construction of a new 1,175 square-foot, two-story single-family residence on an undeveloped 4,213 square-foot lot. The subject site has an average current slope exceeding 50%, which requires approval of a conditional use permit (CUP). The average current slope of the site is 77%. The project requires approval of variances for lot size and to allow one of the two parking spaces to not be directly accessible (accessed by a lift). The project will also require approval from the design review board.
9.	<b>Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:</b> <u>North:</u> Single-family residential uses <u>South:</u> Single-family residential uses <u>East:</u> Single-family residential uses <u>West:</u> Single-family residential uses
10.	<b>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).</b> None

**11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics               | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials     | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing     | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems       | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

**LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Prepared by: *Ron Kiesel* Date: *August 20, 2013*

Reviewed by: *[Signature]* Date: *8/20/13*

Signature of Director of Community Development Department or his or her designee authorizing the release of environmental document for public review and comment.

Director of Community Development Department: *Jimitha Jay* Date: *8-20-13*

**11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**


The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.


- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics               | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forest Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials     | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing     | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems       | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |


**LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:**


On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.


  
 Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_


  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

  
 Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_

  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Director of Community Development Department or his or her designee authorizing the release of environmental document for public review and comment.

  
 Director of Community Development Department: \_\_\_\_\_

  
 Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

The following section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

**A. AESTHETICS**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

**1) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The rectangular-shaped 4,213 square-foot project site is presently vacant and has frontage on both Vista Superba and Corona Drives. The topography of the lot slopes steeply downward from Vista Superba Drive to Corona Drive. The proposed residence will be located in the center of the lot and will be set back 15 feet from both streets.

The subject property is not located on a primary or secondary ridgeline. The residence will be constructed into the hillside in compliance with the Hillside Design Guidelines. No significant impacts on a scenic vista will occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**2) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

**No Impact.** No state scenic highway is located adjacent to or within view of the project site. No impacts to scenic resources within a State scenic highway would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**3) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The subject site is currently undeveloped. The area surrounding the project site is developed with modest-sized single-family residences on modest-sized lots. Homes in this area are built in various architectural styles.

The size of the lot is approximately 4,200 square feet. The proposed residence is sited in the center of the lot and will be built into the natural slope. The design of the new home will require Design Review Board approval. The Board will review the site planning, mass and scale, architecture, materials and landscaping to ensure the project's design is compatible with the surrounding built environment. Impacts to visual character and quality of the site would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) **Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** Day and nighttime lighting for the project would represent a slight increase and would be similar to the existing single-family uses within the project vicinity. Therefore, no significant impacts associated with day and nighttime lighting are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES**

<p><i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i></p>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?				X
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

1) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance within or adjacent to the proposed project site and no agricultural activities take place on the project site. No agricultural use zones currently exist within the city, nor are any agricultural zones proposed. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

**No Impact.** The project site is located in an urbanized area. No portion of the project site is proposed to include agricultural zoning designations or uses, nor do any such uses exist within the city under the current General Plan and zoning. There are no Williamson Act contracts in effect for the project site or surrounding vicinity. No conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract would result. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 3) **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?**

**No Impact.** There is no existing zoning of forest land or timberland in the City of Glendale. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 4) **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

**No Impact.** There is no forest land within the City of Glendale. No forest land would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) **Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

**No Impact.** There is no farmland or forest land in the vicinity of or on the proposed project site. No farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use and no forest land would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**C. AIR QUALITY**

<i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

- 1) **Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**



**No Impact.** The project site is located within the City of Glendale, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the agency responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. The most recent comprehensive plan fully approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is the 2007 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

The AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumption used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily emissions thresholds.

Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the Growth Management Chapter forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP.

Population growth associated with the proposed project is included in the Southern California Associations of Government (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The proposed project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts. Therefore, no impact would occur with relation to a conflict with, or obstruction of, the implementation of the SCAQMD AQMP.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The URBEMIS 2007 model (Version 9.2.4) was used to estimate air quality impacts during the construction and operation stages of the project. Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results are attached. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As indicated in the air quality model run described above, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. No significant impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Sensitive residential receptors are located adjacent to the project site. However, as indicated above, the project would be required to comply with all applicable rules that govern construction related impacts. In addition, as indicated in the model run performed for this project, no construction or operational impacts are anticipated. The project would not expose

sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration and therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

5) **Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project includes the construction of a new two-story single-family residence. The area surrounding the subject site is zoned for and developed with similar uses. Activity typically associated with the construction of new homes may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust in proximity to sensitive receptor locations. Any detectable odors or heavy-duty equipment exhaust would only be associated with the initial construction phase of the project. This phase is considered short-term and typical for this type of construction activity. Significant long-term odor impacts are not anticipated to occur after construction-related activity ceased since only single-family residential use is allowed in this zone. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

D. **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

1) **Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional**

***plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located in the Adams Hill neighborhood. A biological resources survey was conducted as part of the City's Open Space and Conservation Element. The purpose of the survey was to map significant vegetation communities that include chaparral areas, oak woodlands, southern oak riparian, and walnut. The results of survey are shown in Map 4-10 of the Element. As shown on the map, the project site is not located within these areas.

The Element also includes information on the open space areas within Glendale identified by the California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Data Base and the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning "Significant Ecological Area" (SEA) program. The Natural Diversity Data Base and SEA program analyze biotic resources and identify areas with sensitive plant and animal communities. Map 4-13, "Southern Oak Riparian Forest," shows the findings of the Natural Diversity Data Base, and Map 4-12 illustrates the locations of Glendale's Significant Ecological Areas. The proposed project site is not located within the Significant Ecological Area (SEA) or within a Southern Oak Riparian Forest. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on biological resources.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 2) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

**No Impact.** The project site is presently undeveloped located on Vista Superba Drive. The area surrounding the project site includes single-family residences. There are no known riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities that may be affected by the project. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 3) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

**No Impact.** No federally protected wetlands are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 4) ***Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located in a developed area where there are constraints to wildlife movement under the existing condition. Existing development in the area and associated fencing severely limit wildlife movement. Consequently, wildlife movement on the project site is limited to only local movement of wildlife within the immediate vicinity. The proposal to construct a new single-family residence would not result in any significant barrier to wildlife moving through the area. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) ***Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

**No Impact.** The Glendale Municipal Code, Section 12.44 specifically protects six different native or "indigenous" species of trees that include the Coast live oak, Valley oak, Mesa oak, Scrub oak,

California sycamore and California bay. There are no protected trees located on the project site. As a result, no impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

6) **Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

**No Impact.** No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan has been adopted to include the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any such plans. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**E. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				X
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?				X
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	
4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

1) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

**No Impact.** The project site is currently undeveloped, no impacts to a historical resource would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

**No Impact.** Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the local area. The amount of grading required for the proposed project would be less than 600 cubic yards. Due to the small amount of proposed grading and the fact that the immediate surrounding areas are developed with single-family residences, the likelihood of surficial archaeological resources being uncovered is minimal. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. There is a possibility that paleontological resources may exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the proposed project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the proposed project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius (328 feet) must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape and include commercial, industrial, and residential uses. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. Nonetheless, if human remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or reburial). With implementation of this standard requirement no significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

F. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			X	
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?			X	
2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X	
5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X

1) **Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the subject site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. A soils and geology report was prepared by Professional Engineers Consulting Inc., for the proposed project. Based on findings in the report, the potential for surface ground rupture at the subject site is considered low. Therefore, impacts from the rupture of a seismic fault are considered to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project site could be subject to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake originating along one of the faults listed as active or potentially active in the Southern California area. This hazard exists throughout Southern California and could pose a risk to public safety and property by exposing people, property, or infrastructure to potentially adverse effects, including strong seismic ground shaking. Compliance with applicable building codes, , would minimize structural damage to buildings and ensure safety in the event of a moderate or major earthquake. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

iii) **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an area prone to liquefaction as indicated in the City's Safety Element (August 2003). Therefore, no impacts associated with liquefaction would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

iv) **Landslides?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The subject property is located in the Adams Hill neighborhood and is not located in a landslide hazard area. No significant landslide impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) **Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project could result in exposure of onsite soils during construction, since the project site is located on a hillside with elevation differences that require grading. The proposed plan for the new house will require 530 cubic yards of cut of the slope and 10 cubic yards of fill. Soils on the project site would only be exposed for a limited amount of time during site preparation activities; thus, substantial erosion is not expected to occur. An erosion control plan, subject to review and approval by the City Engineer, will be required prior to any construction-related activities. Such plans must include procedures and equipment necessary to contain onsite soils and minimize potential for contaminated runoff from the construction site. As a result, impacts from soil erosion are anticipated to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) **Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an onsite or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Subsidence is the process of lowering the elevation of an area of the earth's surface and can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. The project site is not located in an area of significant subsidence activity and would not include fluid withdrawal or removal. In addition, as indicated in Response F-1 (iii), above, the soil under the project site is not prone to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils are anticipated to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) **Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As indicated in the Soil/Geology Report prepared by Professional Engineers Consulting, Inc. the site is underlain by granitic bedrock. The project site is not located on expansive soil. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

5) **Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project site will be connected to the City's sewer system. No septic tanks will be utilized as part of the project. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
2. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

1) ***Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has prepared the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which is part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Glendale has an adopted Greener Glendale Plan which meets regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by SCAG and adopted by the ARB. The Greener Glendale Plan uses land use development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, transportation measures and other policies that are determined to be feasible to reduce GHG.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. This project is consistent with Greener Glendale Strategies to reduce GHGs.

The project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions since the project is a single-family development and is consistent with the Greener Glendale Plan. Air quality modeling was prepared for the proposed project and the results show that air pollution impacts, including GHG emissions, fall below the thresholds established by SCAG. As a result, no new impacts are anticipated to result from the project.

In an effort to implement State mandates under AB32 and SB375 that address climate change in local land use planning, local land use jurisdictions are generally preparing GHG emission inventories and reduction plans and incorporating climate change policies into local General Plans to ensure development is guided by a land use plan that reduces GHG emissions. The City of Glendale adopted the Greener Glendale Plan with strategies to reduce GHGs. These strategies will provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the City meet its GHG emission reduction targets.

Therefore, it is determined that the project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?***



**Less Than Significant Impact.** For the reasons discussed in Response G.1 above, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?				X
7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?			X	

**1) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

**No Impact.** The proposed project involves the construction of a new two-story single-family residence on an undeveloped lot. The development of a single-family residence does not involve any use, routine transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. No new hazardous materials will be generated at the site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 2) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rule 403 and 402, during the construction phase of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. No significant impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 3) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**No Impact.** The nearest school, Muir Elementary School, is located at 912 South Chevy Chase Drive, approximately one mile northwest of the property. However, the project would not emit any new hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials since the proposal is to construct a new single-family residence. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 4) **Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 6) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?**

**No Impact.** No private airstrips are located in the City of Glendale or in the vicinity of the project site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 7) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**No Impact.** There is no "City Disaster Response Route" located on any streets adjacent to the project site. The nearest designated street is Verdugo Road, as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). Verdugo Road, a "County Evacuation Route", is close to the subject site. The proposed project does not involve any changes to this street nor would the project result in the alteration of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. As such, no impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 8) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is located within a "Fire Hazard Area" and would be required to comply with Glendale Fire Department (GFD) brush clearance requirements. The brush clearance requirements call for the removal of continuous stands of brush and all dead vegetation 100 feet from any structure. The project will be required to comply with the GFD brush clearance requirements throughout the life of the project. In addition, the landscape plans will require approval from GFD prior to issuance of permits. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

I. **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
4. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?			X	
7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

1) ***Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste water discharge requirements. However, as part of Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct storm water discharges. In Glendale, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges, including construction activities. Implementation of the proposed project will require compliance with all the NPDES requirements including the submittal and certification of plans and details showing both construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are integrated into the design of the project. The submittal of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) approved by the City Engineer will also be required to be integrated into the design of the project. Impacts related to water quality are considered to be less than significant with the compliance of all applicable permitting requirements.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project involves construction of a 1,175 square-foot, two-story single-family residence and an attached garage. The subject site is 4,213 square feet in area. The building footprint will cover approximately 27% of the total lot area. As a result, the project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. In addition, the project does not involve additions or withdrawals of groundwater. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The residence will be located in the middle of the site and will be set back 15 feet from both Vista Superba Drive and Corona Drive. The residence will be built into the natural slope. Currently, water which falls on the site is absorbed into the ground on-site or because of the topography drains to Corona Drive. The proposed residence will slightly modify the existing drainage pattern of the site. The method of discharge associated with the area proposed for development will require the approval of the City Engineer. Based on the scope of the proposed project, the project will not substantially alter the natural drainage of the site, and therefore, would not result in substantial increase in runoff. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response 1-3 above.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

5) **Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The amount of impervious surfaces would increase since a new residence will be developed, resulting in a slight increase in the amount runoff compared to existing conditions. The proposed residence, as well as new hardscape areas consume approximately one-third of the lot area. However, the majority of the lot will remain undeveloped. Impacts from runoff as a result of the proposed project are anticipated to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

6) **Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response I-3 above.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

7) **Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

**No Impact.** According to Federal Emergency Management Agency flood hazard maps, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

8) **Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

**No Impact.** As indicated in Response J-1 above, the project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area, as shown on the latest FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

9) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

**No Impact.** According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within inundation zones from failure of upstream dams. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

10) **Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

**No Impact.** Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by sudden water displacement caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption. A review of the County of Los Angeles Flood and Inundation Hazards Map indicates that the site is not within the mapped tsunami inundation boundaries. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**J. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community?				X
2. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

1) **Physically divide an established community?**

**No Impact.** The project site is located on an undeveloped property. The proposed project includes the development of a new two-story single-family residence and attached garage. The site is surrounded by other existing single-family residences. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) **Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The existing zoning designation on the project site is R1R (Restricted Residential) and the General Plan designation is Very Low Density Residential. The proposed use complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan as well as the zoning designation of the area. The City's zoning code requires approval of a conditional use permit when a new residence is proposed on a lot which exceeds 50% average current slope. The average current slope of the site is 78% and, therefore, the project requires approval of a conditional use permit. The purpose of the conditional use permit is to allow special consideration for certain uses to be located in zones other than those in which they are classified as permitted because of their particular characteristics. Such uses may only be suitable in specific locations in a zoning classification or only if such uses are designed or laid out in a particular manner on the site or are subjected to specific conditions to assure compatibility within the zone and its surroundings. The proposed project is the construction of a single-family house located in a single-family zone. Many of the lots in the Adams Hill neighborhood exceed 50% average current slope and this lot characteristic should not impact potential environmental affects if properly engineered and constructed.

The project also requires approval of two variances. The subject lot is smaller (4,213 square feet) than the minimum 7,500 square feet permitted. Similar to the average current slope, lot sizes are typically small in the Adams Hill area. Additionally, the project proposes to provide two parking spaces, one of which is not directly accessible (accessed by a lift). The zoning code requires two accessible parking spaces. Parking is not one of the environmental factors evaluated in the initial study. A less than significant impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) **Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

**No Impact.** There is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in the project site or vicinity. As such, the implementation of the proposed project could not conflict with any such plans. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**K. MINERAL RESOURCES**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

**1) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

**No Impact.** The project site is located in an area containing mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). Although data evaluating deposits is not available, the project site is zoned for residential use and single-family homes are located north and west of the site. Additionally, the area has been previously subdivided. A less than significant impact would occur as a result of the project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**2) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

**No Impact.** As indicated in Response K-1 above, the project site is located in an area containing mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data. A less than significant impact would occur as a result of the project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**L. NOISE**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?				X

1) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

***Less Than Significant Impact.*** The proposed project involves construction of a new single-family residence on a 4,213 square-foot lot. Per the Zoning Code and General Plan – Land Use Element, this type of use is permitted on the subject site. Surrounding land uses include other single-family residences. As shown in the City's Noise Element, the project site is located within a noise contour 60 - 65 CNEL, which is conditionally acceptable. The new structures would be of conventional construction and, therefore, noise levels are not expected to exceed the standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The development of a single-family dwelling unit on this site would not generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. No significant impacts are anticipated.

***Mitigation Measures:*** No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

***Less Than Significant Impact.*** Excessive groundborne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operations, or the use of pile drivers during construction. Due to the underlying terrain, consisting of bedrock, the construction of the proposed home would most likely require drilling of the piles rather than the use of pile drivers. Noise typically generated by the drilling of piles would be generated during the initial construction phase of the project and is temporary in nature. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No significant impacts are anticipated.

***Mitigation Measures:*** No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

***No Impact.*** The project involves the development of a single-family residence and would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise. This use is consistent with the surrounding uses in the area. No impacts would occur.



**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 4) **A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Short-term noise impacts could occur as a result of construction activities. All development within the project site will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or from 7:00 p.m. on Saturday to 7:00 a.m. on Monday or from 7:00 p.m. preceding a holiday. Compliance with the City's noise ordinance would ensure that noise impacts will be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 6) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?**

**No Impact.** There are no private airstrips located on or within the vicinity of the project site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**M. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

- 1) **Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

**No Impact.** The project involves the construction of a new single-family residence, consistent with adjoining development in the area. The subject site is zoned R1R, Floor Area District III with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Very Low Density Residential. The subject site is adjacent to other single-family residences. The proposed single-family residence is consistent with the allowable

uses for the zoning and land use designation of the area and, therefore, is not considered growth inducing. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) **Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** No existing housing will be removed as part of the project since the subject lot is currently undeveloped. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) **Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** The subject site is currently undeveloped; as such, no residents would be displaced as a result of the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**N. PUBLIC SERVICES**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?				X
e) Other public facilities?				X

1) **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

a) **Fire protection?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The nearest fire station is Station 22 located at 1201 South Glendale Avenue, approximately 1.7 miles from the project site. The project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building permits are submitted for approval. In addition, future

residents will be required to comply with GFD brush clearance requirements. Impacts to fire protection are anticipated to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**b) Police protection?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police services to the project site. The nearest police facility is located at 131 North Isabel Street. Project construction will add one residential unit to the area as well as the people who will live in this residence. The site is located in an area of the City developed with single-family uses. The additional population resulting from the proposed project would not have a significant impact on police services.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**c) Schools?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per square foot basis for new residential units or additions to existing units to assist in the construction of or additions to schools. Payment of these fees under the provisions of Government Code Section 65995.5 reduces potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**d) Parks?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The property is zoned for single-family residential use and was not planned for use as a park. The proposed project would not contribute to additional need for parks. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**e) Other public facilities?**

**No Impact.** The project site is undeveloped and zoned for single-family use. The applicant is proposing to construct one single-family residential dwelling consistent with development in the project area. The proposed residence is located in a area of the city intended for single-family residence. As a result, the proposed project can be adequately served by existing public facilities. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**O. RECREATION**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

- 1) **Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

**No Impact.** The project site is undeveloped and zoned for single-family use. The applicant is proposing to construct one single-family residential dwelling. The subject property is located in an area that is developed with other single-family residences and is not anticipated to significantly increase the demand on existing parks. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 2) **Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project involves the construction of a single-family house. No recreational facilities are included in the proposed project. As indicated in Response O-1 above, the project is not anticipated to significantly increase the demand on existing parks, since a single-family residence is considered to be a low intensive land use. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**P. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

<b>Would the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
1. Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X
4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
5. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

- 1) **Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** There would be a temporary increase in day time traffic as a result of the construction activities. A traffic control plan will be required for project construction. Approval of the plan would ensure that potential impacts of trucks associated with grading would be reduced less than significant levels. The proposed project would result in a net increase of one (1) single-family residence above the current condition. A slight increase in the number of vehicles using the area streets (approximately 10 daily trips) is anticipated to create a less than significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 2) **Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

**No Impact.** As discussed above in Response P-1, the proposed project would not result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 3) **Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private air strip. No impacts on air traffic patterns would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 4) **Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

**No Impact.** No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Access to the property will be taken from Vista Superba Drive, which is a local street. No impacts to emergency access would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 6) **Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation since no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs would result from project implementation. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Q. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
3. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

1) ***Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?***

***No Impact.*** Construction work associated with the proposed project as well as project operation would be required to comply with all applicable wastewater treatment requirements included NPDES and Best Management Practices (BMPs). No impacts would occur.

***Mitigation Measures:*** No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

***No Impact.*** The proposed project would result in a net increase of one residential dwelling unit. However, the proposed project is not anticipated to substantially increase the demand for new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the need to expand existing facilities. No impacts would occur.

***Mitigation Measures:*** No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

***No Impact.*** As indicated in Response Q-2 above, the project involves an increase in one residential unit. However, the addition of a single-family house is not expected to substantially increase the demand for new storm water drainage facilities or the need to expand existing facilities or the construction of new facilities. No impacts would occur.

***Mitigation Measures:*** No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Water would be provided to the project site via existing supply lines adjacent to the project site. Adequate water exists to serve the proposed project. The proposed project will be required to comply with the Hillside Landscape Guidelines as well as planting of drought tolerant and California-friendly landscape. No significant impacts to the availability of water are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) ***Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?***

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not create a significant increase in the generation of wastewater and will comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to wastewater. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 6) ***Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The majority of solid waste generated in the City of Glendale is transported to Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City. An ordinance passed by the City of Glendale limits disposal at the landfill to solid wastes generated within the Los Angeles County incorporated Cities of Glendale, La Canada Flintridge, Pasadena, South Pasadena, San Marino, Sierra Madre; the Los Angeles County unincorporated communities known as Altadena, La Crescenta, Montrose; the unincorporated area bordered by the Cities of San Gabriel, Rosemead, Temple City, Arcadia, and Pasadena; the unincorporated area immediately to the north of Arcadia, and Pasadena; and the unincorporated area immediately to the north of the City of San Marino bordered by the City of Pasadena on the west, north and east sides.

Scholl Canyon Landfill has the capacity to accept solid waste until January 2019. Solid waste generation is expected to increase during the construction phase of the project as well as when the future residents move into the single-family residence. However, the existing solid waste system would be sufficient to accommodate waste generated by the project. No significant impacts to solid waste facilities are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 7) ***Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

**No Impact.** The proposed project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations relating to solid waste. All construction debris will be disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local statutes. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**R. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining				X

<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

- 1) ***Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

**No Impact.** No impacts are anticipated to occur to the quality of the environment, fish or wildlife habitats, fish or wildlife populations, plant or animal communities, or to rare, threatened or endangered plant and animal species as a result of the proposed project. No impacts to cultural resources would occur.

- 2) ***Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?***

**No Impact.** Development of the proposed project will not substantially increase traffic nor would it result in a substantial increase in population as this is a single-family residential development. Public facilities are available to accommodate the slight increase in usage due to project development. No impacts would occur.

- 3) ***Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

**No Impact.** Development of the proposed project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans. No impacts would occur.

13. **Earlier Analyses**

None

14. **Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist**

One or more of the following references were incorporated into the Initial Study by reference, and are available for review in the Planning division Office, 633 E. Broadway, Rm. 103, Glendale, CA 91206-4386. Items used are referred to by number on the Initial Study Checklist.

1. Environmental Information Form application and materials submitted on February 6, 2013.



2. The City of Glendale's General Plan, as amended.
3. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
4. "Guidelines of the City of Glendale for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended," August 19, 2003, City of Glendale Planning Division.
5. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
6. "CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook," updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
7. Soil/Geology Report, Professional Engineers Consulting, Inc., January 27, 2013.