



Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
 Telephone (213) 974-6433

PROJECT No. 03-211-(5)
VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP
NO. 060107
OAK TREE PERMIT NO. 03-211

RPC/HO MEETING DATE 2/16/2010	CONTINUE TO
AGENDA ITEM #7	
PUBLIC HEARING DATE February 16, 2010	

APPLICANT Fairview Venture LLC	OWNER Fairview Venture LLC	REPRESENTATIVE Engles Shen
--	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

REQUEST
Vesting Tentative Tract Map: To create one multi-family lot with 10 new detached condominium units on 1.31 gross acres.
Oak Tree Permit: For the removal of one Oak tree and the encroachment into the protected zone of five Oak trees.

LOCATION/ADDRESS 8831-8843 Fairview Avenue, East San Gabriel, CA 91775	ZONED DISTRICT South Santa Anita-Temple City
ACCESS Fairview Avenue	COMMUNITY East Pasadena-San Gabriel
SIZE 1.31 Gross Acres (1.22 Net Acres)	EXISTING ZONING R-A (Residential Agricultural)
EXISTING LAND USE Single-Family Residences	SHAPE Two (2) generally rectangular and one (1) rectangular flag lot
	TOPOGRAPHY Gently to moderately sloping

SURROUNDING LAND USES & ZONING			
North: Single-Family Residences, Multi-Family Residences/R-1 (Single-Family Residence-5,000 square feet lot minimum) & R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence-5,000 square feet lot minimum)		East: Single-Family Residences/R-A (Residential Agriculture-5,000 square feet lot minimum)	
South: Single-Family Residences/R-A		West: Single-Family Residences/R-A & R-1	

GENERAL PLAN	DESIGNATION	MAXIMUM DENSITY	CONSISTENCY
Los Angeles Countywide General Plan	Category 1 (Low Density Residential)	7 Dwelling Units	Yes-Infill

ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS
 Negative Declaration

DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLAN
 The Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Exhibit Map, dated June 29, 2009, depicts one multi-family lot with 10 new detached condominiums on the 1.31 gross acre subject property. The project site currently includes three parcels, each with one single-family residence. The proposed development will be served by a 26 feet wide private driveway and firelane into the subject property with access off of Fairview Avenue. The project will demolish three existing single family homes and two accessory structures. One Oak tree will be removed and encroachments into the protected zone of five Oak trees will occur. The project proposes 155 cubic yards of cut and 664 cubic yards of fill grading. There are 10 guest parking spots and 6 overflow turf block spaces.

- KEY ISSUES**
- The proposed development will impact the six existing oak trees on the subject property. The Oak Tree Permit requests one Oak Tree Removal and the encroachment into the protected zone of five Oak trees.
 - A 26 feet wide private driveway and firelane will be constructed to access the 10 condominium units.
 - An infill study allowed for an increase in the density of the project to 10 units.
 - The proposed project must conform to the East Pasadena-San Gabriel Community Standards District (CSD).
- (If more space is required, use opposite side)*

TO BE COMPLETED ONLY ON CASES TO BE HEARD BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

STAFF CONTACT PERSON		
RPC HEARING DATE (S)	RPC ACTION DATE	RPC RECOMMENDATION
MEMBERS VOTING AYE	MEMBERS VOTING NO	MEMBERS ABSTAINING
STAFF RECOMMENDATION (PRIOR TO HEARING)		
SPEAKERS*	PETITIONS	LETTERS
(O) (F)	(O) (F)	(O) (F)

*(O) = Opponents (F) = In Favor

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION (Subject to revision based on public hearing)

APPROVAL

DENIAL

No improvements ___ 20 Acre Lots ___ 10 Acre Lots ___ 2½ Acre Lots ___ Sect 191.2

Street improvements ___ Paving ___ X ___ Curbs and Gutters ___ X ___ Street Lights

 ___ X ___ Street Trees ___ Inverted Shoulder ___ X ___ Sidewalks ___ Off Site Paving ___ ft.

Water Mains and Hydrants

Drainage Facilities

Sewer Septic Tanks Other _____

Park Dedication "In-Lieu Fee"

SPECIAL INDIVIDUAL DEPARTMENT CONCERNS

Engineer

Road

Flood

Forester & Fire Warden


Parks & Rec.

Health

Planning

ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

- In the East Pasadena-San Gabriel CSD, parcels greater than 40,000 square feet with R-A zoning and multiple residential buildings must have a minimum street frontage of 100 feet, an average lot width of 125 feet, a maximum height of 35 feet for all structures, a minimum rear yard depth of 40 feet, a minimum side yard depth of 10 percent of the average lot width, a minimum front yard depth based on the average of front yard depths of the subject block, a 5 feet side yard setback ratio of 1:1 starting at 10 feet in height, a 20 feet front yard setback ratio of 1:1 starting at 20 feet in height, a minimum 50 percent of front yard landscaping, a minimum 10 feet distance between buildings less than 17 feet high, a minimum 20 feet distance between building more than 17 feet high, a maximum grade equal to the average of adjacent parcels, a maximum of two-story structures, a maximum floor area of 50 percent of the net lot area, maximum lot coverage of 50 percent of net lot area, a minimum 2 parking spaces for structures with 1 to 4 bedrooms, a minimum 3 parking spaces for structures with 5 to 6 bedrooms, a maximum 24 feet wide garage door width for street facing garages, and street lighting consistent with the existing community character. The project meets all CSD requirements.



PROJECT NO. 03-211-(5)

STAFF ANALYSIS

FEBRUARY 16, 2010 HEARING OFFICER PUBLIC HEARING

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107 is a proposed subdivision of land by Fairview Venture LLC ("applicant or subdivider"), to create one multi-family lot with 10 new detached condominium units on 1.31 gross acres. The project includes Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211 for the removal of one Oak tree and the encroachment into the protected zone of five Oak trees. An infill study allowed for an increase in the density of the project to 10 units. The proposed project must conform to the East Pasadena-San Gabriel Community Standards District (CSD). A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project in accordance with the State and County environmental reporting guidelines. Staff determined that the project will have less than significant/no impacts on the environment.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY

Location: The project site is located at 8831-8843 Fairview Avenue, in the unincorporated community of East Pasadena-San Gabriel, South Santa Anita-Temple Zoned District, and Fifth Supervisorial District of Los Angeles County.

Physical Features: The subject property is approximately 1.31 gross acres (1.22 net acres) in size, rectangular in shape, with generally to moderately sloping terrain. There is existing vegetation (grass, shrubs and trees). There are six Oak trees located on the project site.

Existing Development: The subject property currently has three detached single-family residences and two detached accessory structures.

Access: The southern side of the subject property has approximately 131.98 feet of street frontage along Fairview Avenue, a proposed 60-foot wide public street with 36 feet of paved access width.

Services: Domestic water service to the project site will be provided by the East Pasadena Water Company, a public water system. Sewage disposal will be provided through the public sewer and wastewater treatment facilities of the Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 15.

ENTITLEMENTS REQUESTED

Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107: The applicant requests approval of a subdivision of land to create one multi-family lot with 10 new detached condominium units on 1.31 gross acres.

Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211: The applicant requests an Oak Tree Permit for the removal of one Oak tree and the encroachment into the protected zone of five Oak trees (one heritage Oak).

EXISTING ZONING

Subject Property: The 1.22 net acre subject property consists entirely of R-A (Residential-Agricultural - 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area) zoning.

Surrounding Area: Surrounding zoning is as follows:

- North: R-1 (Single Family Residence - 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area) and R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence - 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)
- East: R-A
- South: R-A
- West: R-A and R-1

The proposed development complies with the standards of the R-A zone, to include yard setbacks and allowed use. The project proposes 10 new detached units, each having more than the required distance between main buildings (minimum 10 feet). The project also complies with the R-A zone standard of at least 5,000 square feet of net lot area per proposed dwelling unit provided throughout the project.

EXISTING LAND USES

Subject property: The existing site has three single-family lots with three single-family residences and two accessory structures, all to be removed. There are also existing block walls, wood and chain-link fencing surrounding the property. All fencing and block walls are proposed to be removed, except for the existing block wall along the eastern property line towards the rear of the property.

Surrounding properties: The subject property is surrounded by a total of 15 parcels, each containing one single-family residence except one to the northeast that contains one multi-family residence.

Surrounding land uses within 500 feet of the subject property:

- North: Single-family residences, Multi-family residences
- East: Single-family residences
- South: Single-family residences
- West: Single-family residences

Character of the surrounding area: The surrounding area is a low density single-family residential neighborhood. Nearly all parcels are developed. Surrounding single-family lots range in size from 5,000 to 60,000 square feet, with smaller 5,000 to 8,000 square foot lots predominating. The surrounding area is consistently low density single-family residential to the south, east and west, with some higher density multi-family residences (apartment units) approximately within one-quarter mile to the north and east along Huntington Drive and Lotus Avenue. Approximately 1,000 feet to the east there are larger commercial developments and multi-family residences along Rosemead Avenue. There is also a utility right of way with electric transmission lines and nurseries located approximately 1,000 feet to the west.

Staff Analysis

The neighborhood pattern of development generally consists of a mixture of small and large rectangular residential blocks formed by narrower residential streets, with some larger streets (such as Huntington Drive and Rosemead Boulevard) acting as commercial/higher-density corridors. Many developed residential parcels inside the block lack direct access to public streets and are accessed by private easements, varying in paved width of approximately 10-20 feet. The local area circulation contains a somewhat even mixture of dead-ends, cul-de-sacs and through-connections via intersections between private access easements and public streets.

PREVIOUS CASE/ZONING HISTORY

Previous Cases: The subject property was originally created as a portion of Lot 85 of Tract No. 4850, recorded in February 1922.

Zoning History: The R-A zoning was established by Ordinance No. 6287 effective October 9, 1953.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Proposed Site Design: The Exhibit Map, dated June 29, 2009, depicts one multi-family lot with 10 new detached condominium units. The detached residential units are arranged in a linear design perpendicular to Fairview Avenue. The property front yard is along Fairview Avenue. There is a minimum of 20 feet of distance between units, with 28 feet of front yard setback distance (Unit 1 and 10) and the rear yard setback distance varies from 41 feet (Unit 6) to 47 feet (Unit 5). The easterly and westerly side yard setback distances are 12.83 feet. Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are depicted with an attached two-car garage, driveway and pedestrian walkway fronting onto a proposed 26-foot wide private driveway and fire lane. Units 6, 9 and 10 are depicted with an attached three-car garage, driveway and pedestrian walkway fronting onto a proposed 26-foot wide private driveway and fire lane. A fire truck turnaround is proposed at the end of the development adjacent to Units 5 and 6, approximately 352 feet from Fairview Avenue. There are 10 proposed guest parking spaces located between Units 1 and 2, 4 and 5, 6 and 7, 7 and 8, and 9 and 10 perpendicular to the private driveway/fire lane. An additional six turf block parking spaces with permeable pavers are proposed between Units 3 and 4 and at the end of the private driveway/fire lane towards the rear of the lot. Two covered concrete drainage channels are proposed on the east and west sides of the parcel measuring two feet wide by six feet deep approximately 107 feet perpendicular from Fairview Avenue with fossil filter inserts to collect paleontological artifacts during storm surges. Existing wood fences and concrete block walls are proposed to be removed, except for the block wall along the eastern property line towards the rear of the property.

Access: The subject property has direct access to a public street, Fairview Avenue. The 10 new detached dwelling units will gain access to Fairview Avenue via the proposed 26-foot wide private driveway and fire lane.

Grading: There is approximately 155 cubic yards of cut and 664 cubic yards of fill grading proposed, with 509 cubic yards to be imported from offsite.

Landscaping: The East Pasadena-San Gabriel Community Standards District ("CSD") requires a front yard setback based on the average front yard setback for the entire block.

Staff Analysis

This 28 feet front yard setback will be used for landscaping. The project includes Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211 for the removal of one Oak tree and the encroachment into the protected zone of five Oak trees. A landscape area is set aside adjacent to the private driveway and fire lane between Units 2 and 3 and Units 3 and 4 for two oak tree encroachments. Each unit has small rear and side yards. Units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 have minimal front yards. Additionally, at the rear of the lot located just north of Unit 6 and adjacent to the fire truck turnaround, a small tot lot has been proposed for a play area.

Improvements: Required improvements include those for roadway for the property frontage along Fairview Lane (curb, gutter, sidewalk, street trees, street lights), private driveway and fire lane, drainage, water main connection, sewer main connection, and underground utilities. Additionally, there is a five foot right of way dedication along Fairview Avenue.

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY**GENERAL GOALS AND POLICIES CHAPTER****Urban Revitalization & Infill**

The proposed 10 new detached dwelling units will “improve... residential sections... of the older urban areas of the County” and “reduce the pressure to... develop new urban areas” (General Goals, Page G-10). Infilling of vacant, by-passed or underutilized urban parcels “promotes a more concentrated urban pattern... minimizing the costs of extending and providing public services” (Policy Statements, Page G-12).

Revitalization Priorities

Although, in general, urban infill is encouraged, certain types of infill have priority over others. Related to housing, “rehabilitation” and “renovation” of existing housing stock has priority over the “replacement of housing units” also referred to as “recycling” (Policy Statements, Page G-16). The subdivision proposes to eliminate three existing residences and replace them with 10 new residences. However, as the property is relatively large for the area and has the opportunity to provide additional housing units where the three existing units are sited, preservation of existing housing stock may not be “economically feasible” (Policy 42, Page G-16). Thus, staff supports the type of revitalization currently proposed.

CONSERVATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT**Protecting and Conserving Resources**

Improving air quality and conserving energy are main objectives of the Conservation and Open Space Element (see Objectives, Page OS-19). As an infill project located more proximate to existing facilities, services and employment centers, the proposed development helps to “improve air quality” and “support the conservation of energy” by reducing commute time and encouraging use of “public transportation” (Needs and Policies, Page OS-20). Infill development encourages the conservation of scenic and biotic resources by directing growth into older urbanized areas; avoiding hillsides, ridgelines, “scenic views” and “significant ecological areas” (Needs and Policies, Pages OS-21, 22). This discourages “urban sprawl” and “protect[s] scenic resources from unsightly development” (Needs and Policies, Page OS-22). Preserving natural habitat areas (Needs and Policies, OS-21 and 22) through the implementation of the Oak Tree Ordinance is also a critical component of the Open Space Element. By preserving and protecting existing oak trees on the project site and requiring the replacement of oak trees that are to be removed, this project works to maintain a critical

Staff Analysis

habitat of Los Angeles County.

LAND USE ELEMENTLand Use Efficiency & Compatibility of Development

According to the General Plan, “more efficient use of land” means increasing the density and intensity of development, promoting infill, encouraging co-location of multiple uses, preserving industrial lands, and “recycling” or converting mineral extraction sites to other uses (see Policy Statements, Page LU-9). The proposed development will increase the density of housing from three dwelling units to 10 dwelling units at an infill location. Increasing the density of housing in urbanized areas supports land use efficiency by helping to “take full advantage of existing public service and facility capacities”, and “coordinate land use with existing transportation networks” (Objectives, Page LU-8). Existing transportation networks include facilities such as public streets, freeways, railways and transit stops.

“Compatibility of development” means compatibility between the natural and manmade environments, compatibility of land uses, complementary with community character, and compliance with State and local laws (see Policy Statements, Pages LU-10, 11). As previously described above, the proposed subdivision is compatible with the natural environment because of its infill location, directing growth away from scenic and biotic resources. Second, regarding land use compatibility, the proposed 10 new detached dwelling units are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood, which is predominantly single-family residential. In addition, all adjoining parcels except for one are single-family residences. No significant environmental impacts were identified that would cause the development to be incompatible with surrounding uses, such as excessive noise, fumes, or traffic (see Policy 8, Page LU-10). Third, the subdivision density and design allow for new single-family residences that complement community character in terms of size, scale, setbacks, parking and landscaping. Lastly, through the Subdivision Committee review process and subsequent analysis, staff determined that the proposed development complies with State and local laws such as the Subdivision Map Act, Subdivision Ordinance and Zoning Ordinance (see Policies 18 & 19, Page LU-11).

Land Use Policy Map and Density

The subject property is located within the Category 1 (Low Density Residential – One to Six Dwelling Units per Gross Acre) land use category of the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan (“General Plan”). Category 1 allows a maximum of seven dwelling units (or six dwelling units per acre (“du/ac”)) on the 1.31 gross acre subject property (Land Use Policy Map, Page LU-13). As the proposed density of 10 new dwelling units (or 7.6 DU/ac) exceeds the maximum allowable density, the project must comply with infill findings for the proposed project density, which is within the Category 2 (Low-Medium Density Residential – six to 12 Dwelling Units per Gross Acre) land use category of the General Plan. The applicant has submitted an infill study and burden of proof and is requesting additional density with the infill request. Infill is discussed in more detail in the “Implementation Chapter” subsection below.

Residential-Agricultural Land Use

The current property zoning is R-A, permitting “field, tree, bush, berry and row” crops (Section 22.20.410 of the Los Angeles County code (“County Code”)). As mentioned earlier, the local area is mainly low-density residential, with lot sizes ranging between 5,000 and 60,000 square feet (5,000 to 8,000 square foot lots predominating). The low-density residential area consists mostly of R-A and R-1 zoning, with some R-3 zoning to the north

Staff Analysis

along Lotus Avenue. The project proposes to maximize the density of housing on the subject site, decreasing the amount of open area usable for agriculture. A lower density of less than 10 units would make more land available for agricultural use. R-A zoning supports local small-scale agricultural activities such as farmer's markets and community co-ops. Since the infill potential of the site is being maximized to the extent feasible, the zoning potential (for agriculture) is being reduced by the higher density. However, staff thinks that in this instance, due to the surrounding area and design of the project, infill development is appropriate and can be emphasized over potential agricultural use. The project density is consistent with the surrounding community, and the subject property is not a potential "agricultural preserve" or "prime agricultural land" warranting a more conservative application of infill policy in this area (see General Plan, Pages OS-21 and LU-11). Additionally, approximately 1,000 feet to the west are extensive nurseries and other open spaces with potential for agricultural use under electric transmission lines.

HOUSING ELEMENTNew Construction & Infill

The project proposes new residential development that will increase the overall supply of housing within the County. The Housing Element states that "an ample supply of housing is necessary to stabilize the rising cost of housing" and that "the projected demand for housing can be met by... new construction" (Needs and Policies, Page IV-31). In addition, the proposed infill project "provide[s] for new urban residential development principally in those areas that are in close proximity to existing community services and facilities" (Policy 3, Page IV-31).

IMPLEMENTATION CHAPTERInfill Implementation

The Implementation Chapter of the General Plan states that "infilling warrants the highest priority to meet housing needs... attractive new developments carefully fitted into the fabric of existing urban neighborhoods can provide an impetus for the rehabilitation and/or improvement of surrounding properties" (Priorities, Page VIII-17). Furthermore, the General Plan states that "infill at somewhat higher densities than adjacent uses can be encouraged where it is sensitively designed to fit with and benefit those areas" (Priorities, Page VIII-19).

The proposed development is requesting increased density according to the Infill Implementation Guidelines of the General Plan, which is the County's policy for implementing infill development (see Guidelines, Pages 26 to 29). With infill, the applicant requests a project density of 7.6 DU/ac (or 10 dwelling units), which is within the Category 2 land use category of the General Plan. The existing Category 1 land use category allows a maximum of six du/ac (or seven dwelling units).

According to the Infill Implementation Guidelines of the General Plan, "land division proposals involving residential infill development, where proposed densities exceed those designated by the [General Plan] Land Use Policy Map" must show that:

- a) The proposed project will not disrupt sound residential neighborhoods nor adversely affect the character of the established community;

Staff Analysis

- b) The proposed project site is of sufficient size to accommodate design features (setbacks, landscaping, buffering, etc.) necessary to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses;
- c) The proposed project will not overburden existing public services and facilities;
- d) The proposed use will not disrupt or adversely impact local traffic and parking conditions; and
- e) Compatibility of the proposed project with surrounding uses, in terms of scale, intensity and design, is ensured through specific site plan review.

The applicant's burden of proof responses are attached.

OAK TREE PERMIT

The project site contains six individual Oak trees (*Quercus Agrifolia* genus) in scattered locations that do not form a woodland plant community. The proposed development will require the removal of one Oak tree and the encroachment into the protected zone of five oak trees. Four of the oak trees will require pruning prior to construction activities. The consulting arborist, Robert W. Wallace, completed an updated Oak Tree Report on May 21, 2009. The report indicated the location, condition and "heritage status" of said Oak trees, and whether or not each tree was appropriate for transplanting. The report indicated that the one Oak tree to be removed is not a "heritage" Oak, and that it is not appropriate for transplanting, and, therefore, must be replaced. One of the trees encroached upon is a heritage Oak tree.

Upon review of the updated arborist's report dated May 21, 2009, the Los Angeles County Forester/Fire Warden ("Forester/Fire Warden") issued recommended conditions of approval for the proposed Oak Tree Permit. In his conditions dated October 1, 2009, the Forester/Fire Warden is recommending approval of the permit request with a tree replacement ratio of two to one (2:1) for each of the Oak trees to be removed, or, a total of two new Oak trees to be planted on the project site. The planting location of the replacement Oak trees is indicated on a revised Oak Tree Replacement Plan dated April 2, 2009.

The approval of the Oak Tree Permit is based on the following findings stated in Section 22.56.2100 of the County Code ("burden of proof"):

- a) That construction of the proposed land use will be accomplished without endangering the health of any remaining trees on the property that are subject to Chapter 22.56, Part 16, of the County Code;
- b) That the encroachment of five Oak trees is necessary for development reasons as the trees at the present location frustrates the planned improvements or proposed use of the subject property to such an extent that alternative development plans cannot achieve the same permitted density or the cost of such alternative would be prohibitive;

Staff Analysis

- c) That the encroachment of the Oak trees proposed will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated; and
- d) That the encroachment of the Oak trees proposed will not be contrary to or in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the Oak tree permit procedure.

The applicant's responses are attached.**COMMUNITY STANDARD DISTRICT**

The project is located within the East Pasadena-San Gabriel CSD. In the East Pasadena-San Gabriel CSD, parcels greater than 40,000 square feet with R-A zoning and multiple residential buildings must have a minimum street frontage of 100 feet, an average lot width of 125 feet, a maximum height of 35 feet for all structures, a minimum rear yard depth of 40 feet, a minimum side yard depth of 10 percent of the average lot width, a minimum front yard depth based on the average of front yard depths of the subject block, a five feet side yard setback ratio of one to one (1:1) starting at 10 feet in height, a 20 feet front yard setback ratio of one to one (1:1) starting at 20 feet in height, a minimum 50 percent of front yard landscaping, a minimum 10 feet distance between buildings less than 17 feet high, a minimum 20 feet distance between building more than 17 feet high, a maximum grade equal to the average of adjacent parcels, a maximum of two-story structures, a maximum floor area of 50 percent of the net lot area, maximum lot coverage of 50 percent of net lot area, a minimum two parking spaces for structures with one to four bedrooms, a minimum three parking spaces for structures with five to six bedrooms, a maximum 24 feet wide garage door width for street facing garages, and street lighting consistent with the existing community character.

The proposed project meets all CSD requirements applicable at the tentative map stage. The propose project has a minimum street frontage of 100 feet, an average lot width of 125 feet, a maximum height of 35 feet for all structures, a minimum rear yard depth of 40 feet, a minimum side yard depth of 10 percent of the average lot width, a minimum front yard depth based on the average of front yard depths of the subject block, a 5 feet side yard setback ratio of 1:1 starting at 10 feet in height, a 20 feet front yard setback ratio of 1:1 starting at 20 feet in height, a minimum 50 percent of front yard landscaping, a minimum 10 feet distance between buildings less than 17 feet high, a minimum 20 feet distance between building more than 17 feet high, a maximum grade equal to the average of adjacent parcels, a maximum of two-story structures, a maximum floor area of 50 percent of the net lot area, maximum lot coverage of 50 percent of net lot area, a minimum 2 parking spaces for structures with 1 to 4 bedrooms, a minimum 3 parking spaces for structures with 5 to 6 bedrooms, a maximum 24 feet wide garage door width for street facing garages, and street lighting consistent with the existing community character. All other CSD provisions would be verified prior to building permit issuance.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

On November 10, 2009, staff completed an Initial Study and determined that a Negative Declaration is required, according to the State and County environmental reporting guidelines. The Negative Declaration concludes that the project will have less than significant/no impacts on the environment.

COUNTY DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Subdivision Committee

The Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee ("Subdivision Committee") consists of the Departments of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, and Public Health. The Subdivision Committee has reviewed the Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Exhibit Map dated June 29, 2009, and recommends approval with the attached conditions.

Other Agency Comments (Notice of Consultation)

Staff received one letter response to the Notice of Consultation regarding the environmental determination. The letter, from the East Pasadena Water Company, dated March 19, 2009, indicates that existing water facilities are adequate to serve the proposed development.

Agency correspondence is attached.

LEGAL NOTIFICATION/COMMUNITY OUTREACH

Pursuant to the provisions of Sections 22.60.174 and 22.60.175 of the County Code, the community was appropriately notified of the public hearing by mail, newspaper, property posting, library posting and Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning" website posting).

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

At the time of writing, staff has received no public correspondence regarding the proposed development.

STAFF EVALUATION

I. SUMMARY

1. General Plan Consistency

The proposed development implements the Infill Policy of the General Plan, increases the supply of housing with new construction, and efficiently utilizes resources by proposing higher density on an underutilized parcel in an urbanized area with existing services and facilities. For these reasons, staff has determined that the proposed development is consistent with the General Plan.

2. Subdivision Ordinance Compliance

The subject project complies with all applicable provisions of Title 21 of the County Code, (Subdivision Ordinance), including those provisions related to a minimum street frontage of 50 feet for each residential parcel, required street access, street trees and street improvements. While the County Code requires only one tree within the front yard of each residential lot, staff recommends at least 10 trees (one tree per 5,000 square feet) within the entire project area.

Staff Analysis**3. Infill Study Burden of Proof**

Staff has determined that the applicant's burden of proof responses are sufficient. The project is compatible with the character of the surrounding community, has sufficient design features (such as setbacks, yards, driveway access and onsite parking), will not overburden public facilities (including roads and related traffic/offsite parking), and is designed at a scale compatible with surrounding uses. Other aspects related to the project's compatibility with surrounding development also support the required findings for infill (see Page six above). Based on these facts, staff is recommending approval of the infill request.

4. Oak Tree Permit Burden of Proof

Staff has reviewed the applicant's burden of proof responses for the Oak Tree Permit and believes that the burden has been satisfied. The proposed removal of the one Oak tree and the encroachment into the protected zone of five Oak trees is necessary in order to minimize environmental impacts and road access issues associated with the proposed development. No heritage Oaks are proposed to be removed, one heritage Oak will be encroached upon, and the Forester/Fire Warden has accepted the information prepared by the consulting arborist and issued recommended conditions of approval.

5. Zoning Ordinance Compliance

The subject project complies with all applicable provisions of Title 22 of the County Code, including those provisions related to the CSD and the minimum net lot area of at least 5,000 square feet provided per proposed dwelling unit, building setbacks, and covered resident parking. Any future development would be required to comply with all applicable provisions of the County Code, and include those applicable provisions related to green building, drought-tolerant landscaping, and low impact development (LID), prior to the issuance of building permits. Staff has determined that the proposed development is exempt from LID standards.

6. Environmental Determination

A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project in accordance with the State and County environmental reporting guidelines. Staff determined that the project will have less than significant/no impacts on the environment.

7. Other Permits/Entitlements

As stated above, an Oak Tree Permit was filed for this project that requests the removal of one Oak tree and the encroachment into the protected zone of five Oak trees. Staff has determined that this project meets the oak tree permit burden of proof.

8. Adjacent Municipalities

There are no other municipalities adjacent to the subject site, and no comments have been received from other municipalities.

9. Town Council/Community Response

There is no town council in the area. Staff has not received any information indicating that the local community is concerned with the proposed subdivision, which was initially filed with the County in July of 2003. Staff has not identified any project features that are incompatible with the community character and/or would tend to diminish the quality of life within the existing community.

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis of the facts, staff recommends approval of the project.

FEES/DEPOSITS

If approved as recommended by staff, the following shall apply:

Los Angeles County Librarian:

A fee (currently \$788.00 per dwelling unit) must be paid prior to building permit issuance for library facilities mitigation.

California Department of Fish and Game:

A processing fee (currently \$2,085.25) associated with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination with the County Clerk, to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game.

Department of Regional Planning, Land Divisions:

A fee of \$200.00 per inspection for bond release will be collected to ensure completion/installation of onsite improvements related to private driveway/fire lane paving and posting, and front yard tree planting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Hearing Officer close the public hearing, approve the Negative Declaration, and **approve** Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107 and Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211 with the attached findings and conditions.

Attachments:

- Factual
- Thomas Brothers Guide Map Page
- Draft Findings
- Draft Conditions
- Correspondence
- Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107 and Exhibit Map, dated June 29, 2009
- Land Use Map
- GIS-Net Map

SMT:DK:GHH
01/27/2010

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FINDINGS OF THE HEARING OFFICER
OAK TREE PERMIT CASE NO. 03-211**

1. A Los Angeles County Hearing Officer ("Hearing Officer"), Mr. Mitch Glaser, conducted a duly noticed public hearing on the matter of Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211. Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211 was concurrently with Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107 on February 16, 2010.
2. Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211 is a request by the applicant, Mr. David Mak, to remove one Oak tree and the encroachment into the protected zone of five Oak trees (one heritage Oak).
3. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107 ("TR060107") is an associated request to create 10 new detached condominium units on 1.31 gross acres.
4. The subject site is located at 8831, 8835 and 8843 Fairview Avenue, in the South Santa Anita-Temple City Zoned District and the unincorporated community of East Pasadena-San Gabriel.
5. The applicant submitted an Oak Tree Report prepared by Robert W. Wallace, dated May 21, 2009, that identifies and evaluates a total of six Oak trees on the subject property.
6. The applicant has submitted an Oak tree permit burden of proof to support his request for the Oak Tree Permit.
7. The Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden ("Forester"), has reviewed the Oak Tree Report dated May 21, 2009 and determined that the document is accurate and complete as to the location, size, condition and species of the Oak trees on the site. The Forester has recommended approval of the requested Oak tree removal and encroachments, subject to recommended conditions of approval, including replacement of oak tree removals at a ratio of two to one (2:1) for a total of two mitigation Oak trees.
8. The property is 1.31 gross acres in size with level topography. The site is developed with three single family residences and one accessory structure for storage that will all be demolished.
9. The project proposes approximately 155 cubic yards of "cut" grading, 664 cubic yards of "fill" grading and 509 cubic yards of "fill" grading to be imported onsite.
10. The site plan labeled "Tree Location Map", dated May 21, 2009, depicts six existing Oak trees with driplines and protected zones, each tree labeled "remove oak" or "existing oak". The six Oak trees are shown on the plan that also depicts

10 new detached condominium units associated with the pending Vesting Tentative Tract Map 060107. Oak Nos. 1 and 3 labeled on the tree location map are located in the southern portion of the subject property and will be encroached upon by a proposed 26-foot wide private driveway and fire lane providing access to the 10 condominium units and three of the condominium units. Permeable pavers will be used around the trunk of Oak No. 1 and 3 to minimize impacts to the root system. Oak No. 2 is to be removed and located in the southeasterly portion of the subject property within an area proposed for a condominium unit. Oak No. 4 is located along the westerly side of the subject property and will be encroached upon by a proposed condominium unit. Oak No. 5 and 6 is located along the northern side of the subject property and will be encroached upon by a proposed turnaround radius for the 26-foot wide private driveway and fire lane providing access to the 10 condominium units.

11. The project site is currently zoned R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area). Surrounding zoning is R-1 (Single-Family Residence) and R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence) to the north, R-A to the south, R-A to the east, and R-A and R-1 to the west.
12. Surrounding land uses are single-family residences and multi-family residences to the north, single-family residences to the south, single-family residences to the east and single-family residences to the west.
13. The subject property is depicted within the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan (“General Plan”) Category 1 (Low Density Residential), on the Land Use Policy Map.
14. COMMENT ON CORRESPONDENCE
15. DESCRIBE IN SEQUENCE WHAT HAPPENED AT THE HEARING(S)
16. Approval of this permit is conditioned on the permittee’s compliance with the attached conditions of approval for TR060107.
17. The subject permit request has been found to be consistent with the General Plan. The removal of one Oak tree and the encroachment of five Oak trees is consistent with the open space and conservation policies of the General Plan. Further, approval of the subject permit request will facilitate increased housing at an urban infill location, consistent with the land use and housing policies of the General Plan.
18. An Initial Study was prepared for this project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et. seq.)

("CEQA"), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study identified no significant effects on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, a Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project.

19. After consideration of the attached Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, the Hearing Officer finds on the basis of the whole record before the Hearing Officer that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, finds the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Hearing Officer, and adopts the Negative Declaration.
20. This project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.
21. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Hearing Officer's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

BASED ON THE FOREGOING, THE HEARING OFFICER CONCLUDES:

- A. That construction of the proposed land use will be accomplished without endangering the health of any remaining trees on the property that are subject to Chapter 22.56, Part 16, of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code");
- B. That the removal and encroachments proposed will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters which cannot be satisfactorily mitigated; and
- C. That the removal and encroachments proposed will not be contrary to or in substantial conflict with the intent and purpose of the Oak tree permit procedure.

THEREFORE, the information submitted by the applicant and presented at the public hearing substantiates the required findings for an Oak tree permit as set forth in Section 22.56.2100 of the County Code (Zoning Ordinance).

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211 is approved, subject to the attached conditions of the Hearing Officer and recommendations of staff.

**DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
OAK TREE PERMIT CASE NO. 03-211**

DRAFT CONDITIONS:

(Questions relating to these conditions should be addressed to the Forestry Division, Prevention Bureau of the Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden ("Forester") at either 818-890-5719 or 323-881-2481).

1. This grant allows the removal of one tree of the Oak genus (*Quercus agrifolia*) identified as Tree Number 2 on the applicant's site plan map and Oak Tree Report. This grant allows the encroachment into the protected zone of five (5) trees of the Oak genus (*Quercus agrifolia*) identified as Tree Numbers 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 (Oak tree No. 3 is a heritage Oak) on the applicant's site plan and in the Oak Tree Report prepared by Randy Smith, consulting arborist, dated May 21, 2009.
2. Unless otherwise apparent from the context, the term "permittee" shall include the applicant and any other person, corporation, or other entity making use of this grant.
3. This grant shall not be effective until the permittee and the owner of the property if other than the permittee, have filed at the office of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") an affidavit stating that they are aware of, and agree to accept, all of the conditions of this grant and that the conditions have been recorded as required by Condition No. 4 and until all required monies have been paid pursuant to Condition Nos. 9 and 11. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this condition No. 3 and Condition Nos. 9, 31, 32 and 33 shall be effective immediately upon final approval of this grant by the County.
4. Prior to the use of this grant, the terms and conditions of the grant shall be recorded in the office of the Los Angeles County Recorder. In addition, upon any transfer or lease of the subject property during the term of this grant, the permittee shall promptly provide a copy of the grant and its terms and conditions to the transferee or lessee, as applicable, of the subject property.
5. If any provision of this grant is held or declared to be invalid, the permit shall be void and the privileges granted hereunder shall lapse.
6. The subject property shall be developed, maintained and operated in full compliance with the conditions of this grant and any law, statute, ordinance, or other regulation applicable to any development or activity on the subject property. Failure of the permittee to cease any development or activity not in such full compliance shall be a violation of these conditions.

7. All requirements of the Zoning Ordinance and of the specific zoning of the subject property must be complied with unless specifically modified by this grant, as set forth in these conditions or shown on the approved plans.
8. No oak tree shall be removed until the permittee has obtained all permits and approvals required for the work which necessitates such removal.
9. Within three (3) days after approval, the permittee shall remit processing fees (currently \$2,085.25) payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.
10. The term "Oak Tree Report" refers to the document on file at Regional Planning by Robert W. Wallace, the consulting arborist, dated May 21, 2009.
11. The permittee shall, prior to commencement of the use authorized by this grant, deposit with the County of Los Angeles Fire Department ("Fire") a sum of \$300. Such fees shall be used to compensate the Forester \$100 per inspection to cover expenses incurred while inspecting the project to determine the permittee's compliance with the conditions of approval. The above fees provide for one (1) initial inspection of temporary fencing (required to secure the protected zone of the remaining Oak tree), prior to the commencement of construction and two (2) subsequent annual inspections until the conditions of approval have been met.

The Director of Regional Planning and the County Forester shall retain the right to make regular and unannounced site inspections.

12. Before commencing work authorized or required by this grant, the consulting arborist shall submit a letter to the Director of Planning and Fire, Forestry Division stating that he or she has been retained by the permittee to perform or supervise the work, and fully comply with the conditions of the grant. The arborist shall also submit a written report on permit compliance upon completion of the work required by this grant. The report shall include a diagram showing the exact number and location of all mitigation trees planted as well as planting dates.
13. All individual associated with the project as it relates to the Oak resource shall be familiar with the Oak Tree Report, Oak Tree map, mitigation planting plan and condition of approval.

The permittee shall arrange for the consulting arborist or a similarly qualified person to maintain the remaining Oak trees on the subject property that is within

the zone of impact as determined by the Forester for the life of the Oak Tree Permit or the Vesting Tentative Tract Map.

14. The permittee shall install temporary chain-link fencing, not less than four (4) feet in height, to secure the protected zone of the remaining Oak trees on site as necessary. The fencing shall be installed prior to grading or tree removal, and shall not be removed without approval of the Forester. The term "protected zone" refers to the area extending five feet beyond the dripline of the Oak tree (before pruning), or fifteen feet from the trunk, whichever is greater.
15. Copies of the Oak Tree Report, Oak tree map, mitigation planting plan and condition of approval shall be kept on the project site and available for review. If the conditions of approval are not present on site during a monitoring inspection of an active project, the Forester will give an immediate "Stop Work Order". This will be administered both verbally and in writing. The "Stop Work Order" will be rescinded after the conditions of approval are present on the site and all employees associated with the project are fully aware of these conditions.
16. This grant allows the removal of one (1) tree of the Oak genus (*Quercus agrifolia*) identified as Tree Number 2 on the applicant's site plan and Oak Tree Report.

This grant allows encroachment within the protected zone of five (5) trees of the Oak genus identified as Tree Numbers 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6 on the applicant's site plan map and Oak Tree Report. Trenching, excavation, or clearance of vegetation within the protected zone of an Oak tree shall be accomplished by the use of hand tools or small hand-held power tools. The Forester must approve use of other equipment not specified. Any major roots encountered shall be conserved to the extent possible and treated as recommended by the consulting arborist.

17. In addition to the work expressly allowed by this permit, remedial pruning intended to ensure the continued health of the protected Oak trees or to improve their appearance or structure may be performed. Such pruning shall include the removal of deadwood and stubs and medium pruning of branches two-inches in diameter or less in accordance with the guidelines published by the National Arborist Association. Copies of these guidelines are available from Fire, Forestry Division. In no case shall more than 20 percent of the tree canopy of any one tree be removed.
18. Except as otherwise expressly authorized by this grant, the remaining Oak trees shall be maintained in accordance with the principles set forth in the publication, "Oak Trees: Care and Maintenance", prepared by Fire, Forestry Division. A copy of the publication is enclosed with these conditions.

19. The permittee shall provide mitigation trees of the Oak genus at a rate of two to one (2:1) trees for each tree removed for a total of two (2) trees.

The permittee shall provide mitigation trees of the Oak genus at a rate of two to one (2:1) for any tree specified above that dies as a result of the approved encroachment.

20. Each mitigation tree shall be at least a 15-gallon specimen in size and measure one (1) inch or more in diameter one (1) foot above the base. Free form trees with multiple stems are permissible; the combined diameter of the two (2) largest stems of such trees shall measure a minimum of one (1) inch in diameter one (1) foot above the base.
21. Mitigation trees shall consist of indigenous varieties of *Quercus agrifolia* grown from a local seed source.
22. Mitigation trees shall be planted within one (1) year of the permitted Oak tree removal. Additional mitigation trees shall be planted within one (1) year of the death of any tree that dies as a result of its permitted encroachment. Mitigation trees shall be planted either on site or at an off-site location approved by the Forester. Alternatively, a contribution to the County of Los Angeles Oak Forest Special Fund may be made in the amount equivalent to the Oak resource loss. The contribution shall be calculated by the Forester based on \$550 for each mitigation tree required.
23. The permittee shall properly maintain each mitigation tree and shall replace any tree failing to survive due to a lack of proper care and maintenance with a tree meeting the specifications set forth above. The two-year maintenance period will begin upon receipt of a letter from the permittee or consulting arborist to the Director of Regional Planning and the Forester indicating that the mitigation trees have been planted. The maintenance period of the trees failing to survive two (2) years will start anew with the new replacement trees. Subsequently, additional monitoring fees shall be required.
24. All mitigation Oak tree planted as a condition of this permit shall be protected in perpetuity by the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance once they have survived the require maintenance period.
25. No planting or irrigation system shall be installed within the dripline of any Oak tree that will be retained.
26. Utility trenches shall not be routed within the protected zone of an Oak tree

unless the serving utility requires such locations.

27. Equipment, materials and vehicles shall not be stored, parked, or operate within the protected zone of any Oak tree. No temporary structures shall be placed within the protected zone of any Oak tree.
28. Violations of the condition of this grant shall result in immediate work stoppage or in a notice of correction depending on the nature of the violation. A time frame within which deficiencies must be corrected will be indicated on the notice of correction.
29. Should any future inspection disclose that the subject property is being used in violation of any one of the conditions of the grant, the permittee shall be held financially responsible and shall reimburse Fire, Forestry Division for all enforcement efforts necessary to bring the subject property into compliance.
30. Notice is hereby given that any person violating a provision of this grant is guilty of a misdemeanor. Notice is further given that the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") or Hearing Officer may, after conducting a public hearing, revoke or modify this grant, if the Commission or Hearing Officer finds that these conditions have been violated or that this grant has been exercised so as to be detrimental to the public health or safety or as to be a nuisance.
31. The permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless Los Angeles County (the "County"), its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the County, or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this permit approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 65009 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall notify the permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding and the County shall fully cooperate in the defense.
32. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the permittee shall, within ten days of the filing, pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expense involved in the department's cooperation in the defense, including, but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to the permittee or permittee's counsel. The permittee shall also pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:
 - a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred by the department reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the permittee shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the

initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.

- b. At the sole discretion of the permittee, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by permittee in accordance with Section 2.170.010 of the Los Angeles County Code.

33. This grant shall expire unless used within two years after the recordation of a final map for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107. In the event that the tentative map should expire without the recordation of a final map, this grant shall terminate upon the expiration of the tentative map. Entitlement to the use of the property thereafter shall be subject to the regulations then in effect.
34. This grant shall terminate upon the completion of the authorized Oak tree encroachment and the completion of all required mitigation and monitoring to the satisfaction of the Forester and Regional Planning.

DRAFT

**DRAFT FINDINGS OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FOR VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 060107**

1. The Los Angeles County Hearing Officer ("Hearing Officer"), Mr. Mitch Glaser, conducted a duly noticed public hearing in the matter of Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107 was heard concurrently with Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211 on February 16, 2010.
2. Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107 is a proposal to create one multi-family lot with 10 new detached condominium units on 1.31 gross acres.
3. Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211 is an associated request to remove one Oak tree and the encroachment into the protected zone of five Oak trees, one of which is a heritage Oak tree.
4. The subject site is located at 8831, 8835 and 8843 Fairview Avenue, East Pasadena-San Gabriel in the South Santa Anita-Temple City Zoned District.
5. The property is 1.31 gross acre in size with level topography. The site is developed with three single-family residences and one accessory structure for storage that will all be demolished.
6. The project site is currently zoned R-A (Residential Agricultural – 5,000 Square Feet Required Minimum Lot Size). Surrounding zoning is R-1 (Single-Family Residence) and R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence) to the north, R-A to the south, R-A to the east, and R-A and R-1 to the west.
7. Access to the proposed development will be provided from the south via Fairview Avenue, a 50 foot wide public street.
8. Surrounding land uses are single-family residences and multi-family residences to the north, single-family residences to the south, single-family residences to the east and single-family residences to the west.
9. The proposed project is consistent with the R-A zoning classification. Pursuant to Section 22.20.460 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code"), detached units with lots that provide at least 5,000 square feet per unit are permitted in the R-A zone.
10. The project proposes approximately 155 cubic yards of "cut" grading, 664 cubic yards of "fill" grading and 509 cubic yards of "fill" grading to be imported onsite.
11. The subject property is depicted within the Los Angeles Countywide General Plan ("General Plan") Category 1 (Low Density Residential), on the Land Use

Policy Map. The applicant's proposal to create one lot with 10 new detached condominiums, approximately 7.6 or seven dwelling units per acre, exceeds the maximum eight dwelling units permitted for the property. However, the General Plan supports concentrated urban development. Specifically, "infill" residential development at "slightly higher" densities may be permitted (i.e., infill parcels designated for a Low Density Residential density may be developed at the Medium Residential density of 12 to 22 dwelling units per acre). The project's higher density is consistent with the residential infill policy of the General Plan since it meets the following criteria:

- a. The proposed project will not disrupt sound residential neighborhoods nor adversely affect the character of the established community since the surrounding area has a variety of residential and commercial uses. Surrounding residential densities range from 0.8 dwelling units per acre up to 26 dwelling units per acre.
 - b. The proposed project site is of sufficient size to accommodate design features (setbacks, landscaping, buffering, etc.) necessary to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses.
 - c. The proposed project will not overburden existing public services and facilities, as described in the Negative Declaration prepared for the project.
 - d. The proposed use will not disrupt or adversely impact local traffic and parking conditions. There are two covered parking spaces for each condominium unit and 13 guest parking spaces. The Negative Declaration prepared for the project concludes that the proposed residential development will not adversely affect local traffic conditions.
 - e. Compatibility of the proposed project with surrounding uses, in terms of scale, intensity, and design, is ensured through specific site plan review. The Exhibit Map submitted by the applicant depicts a residential development that is compatible with the character, scale, and design of the surrounding neighborhood.
12. The Hearing Officer finds the proposed project and the provisions for its design and improvement are consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan. The project increases the supply of housing and promotes the efficient use of land through a more concentrated pattern of urban development.
13. The proposed project meets all CSD requirements applicable at the tentative map stage. The proposed project has a minimum street frontage of 100 feet, an average lot width of 125 feet, a maximum height of 35 feet for all structures, a minimum rear yard depth of 40 feet, a minimum side yard depth of 10 percent of the average lot width, a minimum front yard depth based on the average of front yard depths of the subject block, a 5 feet side yard setback ratio of 1:1 starting at 10 feet in height, a 20 feet front yard setback ratio of 1:1 starting at 20 feet in height, a minimum 50 percent of front yard landscaping, a minimum 10 feet

distance between buildings less than 17 feet high, a minimum 20 feet distance between building more than 17 feet high, a maximum grade equal to the average of adjacent parcels, a maximum of two-story structures, a maximum floor area of 50 percent of the net lot area, maximum lot coverage of 50 percent of net lot area, a minimum 2 parking spaces for structures with 1 to 4 bedrooms, a minimum 3 parking spaces for structures with 5 to 6 bedrooms, a maximum 24 feet wide garage door width for street facing garages, and street lighting consistent with the existing community character. All other CSD provisions would be verified prior to building permit issuance.

14. COMMENT ON CORRESPONDENCE
15. DESCRIBE IN SEQUENCE WHAT HAPPENED AT THE HEARING(S)
16. The Hearing Officer finds that in addition to the required front yard tree, at least nine additional trees are required throughout the project site.
17. Approval of this permit is conditioned on the subdivider's compliance with the attached conditions of approval for Oak Tree Permit Case No. 03-211.
18. The proposed development is compatible with surrounding land use patterns. Residential development surrounds the subject property to the east, west and south.
19. The site is physically suitable for the type of development and density being proposed, since the property is relatively level and has adequate building sites to be developed in accordance with the County grading ordinance, has access to a County-maintained street, will be served by public sewers, will be provided with water supplies and distribution facilities to meet anticipated domestic and fire protection needs; and will have flood hazards and geological hazards mitigated in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works.
20. The design of the subdivision and the type of improvements proposed will not cause serious public health problems, since sewage disposal, storm drainage, fire protection, and geological and soils factors are addressed in the conditions of approval.
21. The design of the subdivision and the proposed improvements will not cause substantial environmental damage or substantial and avoidable injury to fish or wildlife or their habitat. The subject property is not located in a Significant Ecological Area and does not contain any stream courses or high value riparian habitat.

22. The design of the subdivision provides to the extent feasible, for future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities therein.
23. The division and development of the property in the manner set forth on this map will not unreasonably interfere with the free and complete exercise of public entity and/or public utility rights-of-way and/or easements within this map, since the design and development as set forth in the conditions of approval and shown on the tentative map, provide adequate protection for any such easements.
24. Pursuant to Article 3.5 of the Subdivision Map Act, the proposed subdivision does not contain or front upon any public waterway, river, stream, coastline, shoreline, lake or reservoir.
25. The discharge of sewage from this land division into the public sewer system will not violate the requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board pursuant to Division 7 (Commencing with Section 13000) of the California Water Code.
26. Vesting Tentative Tract Map has been submitted as a "Vesting" Tentative Map. As such, it is subject to the provisions of Section 21.38.010 through 21.38.080 of the Los Angeles County Code.
27. The housing and employment needs of the region were considered and balanced against the public service needs of local residents and available fiscal and environmental resources when the project was determined to be consistent with the General Plan.
28. A Negative Declaration has been recommended for this project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the Los Angeles County Environmental Reporting Guidelines.
29. Based on the entire record, it cannot be found that the subject project does not have "no effect" on fish and wildlife resources. Therefore, the project is not exempt from California Department of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Fee.
30. The location of the documents and other materials constituting the record of proceedings upon which the Hearing Officer's decision is based in this matter is the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), 13th Floor, Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012. The custodian of such documents and materials shall be the Section Head of the Land Divisions Section, Regional Planning.

THEREFORE, in view of the findings of fact and conclusions presented above, the Negative Declaration is approved and Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 060107 is approved subject to the attached conditions established by the Hearing Officer and recommended by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee.

DRAFT

DRAFT CONDITIONS:

1. The subdivider shall conform to the applicable requirements of Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code"), the area requirements of the R-A (Residential-Agricultural - 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area) zone, and the East Pasadena-San Gabriel Community Standards District ("CSD").
2. The subdivider shall place the following note on the final map to the satisfaction of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning") and Los Angeles County Department of Public Works ("Public Works"): "Lot No. 1 of this map is approved as a condominium project for a total of 10 detached residential units whereby the owners of the units of air space will hold an undivided interest in the common areas which will in turn provide the necessary access and utility easement for the units."
3. The subdivider shall submit a copy of the draft Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions ("CC&R's") to Regional Planning for review and approval prior to final map approval."
4. The subdivider shall label the driveway as "Private Driveway and Firelane" on the final map.
5. The subdivider shall post the driveway with "No Parking—Fire Lane" signs and provide for its continued enforcement in the CC&R's. Submit a copy of the document to be recorded to the Regional Planning for approval prior to final map approval.
6. The subject property shall be developed and maintained in substantial compliance with the approved Exhibit Map, dated June 29, 2009.
7. The subdivider shall switch guest parking spots marked 7 and 8 on the Exhibit Map dated June 29, 2009 located between Unit Nos. 8 and 9 with the turf block located between Unit Nos. 7 and 8. The relocated turf block located between Units No. 8 and 9 shall be used for the required fire hydrant consistent with the Los Angeles County Fire Department ("Fire") conditions. An amended Exhibit Map shall be submitted to Regional Planning prior to Final Map approval.
8. The subdivider shall provide proof of the removal of the three single-family homes and two accessory structures through a copy of a demolition permit from Public Works and dated photographs of the subject project site that demonstrates the removal of all subject structures prior to final map approval.

9. The subdivider shall construct or bond with Public Works for driveway paving in widths as shown on the approved Exhibit Map, dated June 29, 2009 to the satisfaction of Regional Planning and Fire.
10. Pursuant to Chapter 22.72 of the County Code, the subdivider or his successor in interest shall pay a fee (currently \$788.00 per dwelling unit) to the Los Angeles County Librarian prior to issuance of any building permit and provide proof of payment to Regional Planning.
11. The subdivider shall provide in the CC&R's a method for ensuring that an adequate lighting system along all walkways is constructed within the common areas to the satisfaction of Regional Planning. Submit a copy of the document to be recorded to Regional Planning prior to final map approval.
12. The subdivider shall provide in the CC&R's a method for continual maintenance of the common areas, including the driveways and the lighting system along the walkways to the satisfaction of Regional Planning. Submit a copy of the document to be recorded to Regional Planning prior to final map approval.
13. The subdivider or successor in interest shall plant at least 10 trees or one tree per 5,000 square feet throughout the project site, including at least one in the front yard. The location and the species of the trees shall be incorporated into a site plan or landscape plan to be approved by the Director of Regional Planning and the Los Angeles County Forester and Fire Warden. Prior to final map approval, a bond shall be posted with the Public Works or other verification shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Regional Planning to ensure the planting of the required trees.
14. Within three days of approval, remit processing fees of \$2,085.25 payable to the County of Los Angeles in connection with the filing and posting of a Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21152 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 711 of the California Fish and Game Code to defray the costs of fish and wildlife protection and management incurred by the California Department of Fish and Game. No project subject to this requirement is final, vested or operative until the fee is paid.
15. The subdivider shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its agents, officers, and employees from any claim, action, or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers, or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this approval, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code Section 66499.32 or any other applicable limitation period. The County shall promptly notify the subdivider of any claim, action or proceeding and the County shall

cooperate fully in the defense. If the County fails to promptly notify the subdivider of any claim, action or proceeding, or if the County fails to cooperate fully in the defense, the subdivider shall not, thereafter, be responsible to defend, indemnify, or hold harmless the County.

16. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described in the condition above is filed against the County, the subdivider shall within ten days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of \$5,000, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted for the purpose of defraying the expenses involved in Regional Planning's cooperation in the defense, including but not limited to, depositions, testimony, and other assistance to the subdivider or subdivider's counsel. The subdivider shall pay the following supplemental deposits, from which actual costs shall be billed and deducted:
 - a. If during the litigation process, actual costs incurred reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the subdivider shall deposit additional funds sufficient to bring the balance up to the amount of the initial deposit. There is no limit to the number of supplemental deposits that may be required prior to completion of the litigation.
 - b. At the sole discretion of the subdivider, the amount of an initial or supplemental deposit may exceed the minimum amounts defined herein.

The cost of the collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by the subdivider according to County Code Section 2.170.010.

Except as modified herein above, this approval is subject to all those conditions set forth in the attached reports recommended by the Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee, which consists of Public Works, Los Angeles County Fire Department, Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Health, in addition to Regional Planning.

The following reports consisting of 11 pages are the recommendations of Public Works.

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. Details and notes shown on the tentative map are not necessarily approved. Any details or notes which may be inconsistent with requirements of ordinances, general conditions of approval, or Department policies must be specifically approved in other conditions, or ordinance requirements are modified to those shown on the tentative map upon approval by the Advisory agency.
2. Easements are tentatively required, subject to review by the Director of Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.
3. Easements shall not be granted or recorded within areas proposed to be granted, dedicated, or offered for dedication for public streets, highways, access rights, building restriction rights, or other easements until after the final map is filed with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office. If easements are granted after the date of tentative approval, a subordination must be executed by the easement holder prior to the filing of the final map.
4. In lieu of establishing the final specific locations of structures on each lot/parcel at this time, the owner, at the time of issuance of a grading or building permit, agrees to develop the property in conformance with the County Code and other appropriate ordinances such as the Building Code, Plumbing Code, Grading Ordinance, Highway Permit Ordinance, Mechanical Code, Zoning Ordinance, Undergrounding of Utilities Ordinance, Water Ordinance, Sanitary Sewer and Industrial Waste Ordinance, Electrical Code, and Fire Code. Improvements and other requirements may be imposed pursuant to such codes and ordinances.
5. All easements existing at the time of final map approval must be accounted for on the approved tentative map. This includes the location, owner, purpose, and recording reference for all existing easements. If an easement is blanket or indeterminate in nature, a statement to that effect must be shown on the tentative map in lieu of its location. If all easements have not been accounted for, submit a corrected tentative map to the Department of Regional Planning for approval.

6. Adjust, relocate, and/or eliminate lot lines, lots, streets, easements, grading, geotechnical protective devices, and/or physical improvements to comply with ordinances, policies, and standards in effect at the date the County determined the application to be complete all to the satisfaction of Public Works.
7. Quitclaim or relocate easements running through proposed structures.
8. Place standard condominium notes on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.
9. Prior to final approval of the tract/parcel map submit a notarized affidavit to the Director of Public Works, signed by all owners of record at the time of filing of the map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office, stating that any proposed condominium building has not been constructed or that all buildings have not been occupied or rented and that said building will not be occupied or rented until after the filing of the map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.
10. Label driveways and multiple access strips as "Private Driveway and Fire Lane" and delineate on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.
11. Reserve reciprocal easements for drainage, ingress/egress, sewer, water, utilities, right to grade, and maintenance purposes, etc., in documents over the common private driveways to the satisfaction of Public Works.
12. Remove existing buildings prior to final map approval. Demolition permits are required from the Building and Safety office.
13. Prior to submitting the tract map to the Director of Public Works for examination pursuant to Section 66442 of the Government Code, obtain clearances from all affected Departments and Divisions, including a clearance from the Subdivision Mapping Section of the Land Development Division of Public Works for the following mapping items; mathematical accuracy; survey analysis; and correctness of certificates, signatures, etc.
14. A final guarantee will be required at the time of filing of the final map with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.
15. A final tract map must be processed through the Director of Public Works prior to being filed with the Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk's Office.

16. Within 30 days of the approval date of this land use entitlement or at the time of first plan check submittal, the applicant shall deposit the sum of \$2,000 (Minor Land Divisions) or \$5,000 (Major Land Divisions) with Public Works to defray the cost of verifying conditions of approval for the purpose of issuing final map clearances. This deposit will cover the actual cost of reviewing conditions of approval for Conditional Use Permits, Tentative Tract and Parcel Maps, Vesting Tentative Tract and Parcel Maps, Oak Tree Permits, Specific Plans, General Plan Amendments, Zone Changes, CEQA Mitigation Monitoring Programs and Regulatory Permits from State and Federal Agencies (Fish and Game, USF&W, Army Corps, RWQCB, etc.) as they relate to the various plan check activities and improvement plan designs. In addition, this deposit will be used to conduct site field reviews and attend meetings requested by the applicant and/or his agents for the purpose of resolving technical issues on condition compliance as they relate to improvement plan design, engineering studies, highway alignment studies and tract/parcel map boundary, title and easement issues. When 80% of the deposit is expended, the applicant will be required to provide additional funds to restore the initial deposit. Remaining balances in the deposit account will be refunded upon final map recordation

HW
Prepared by Henry Wong
tr60107L-rev5.doc

Phone (626) 458-4910

Date 07-21-2009



**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
WWW.DPW.LACOUNTY.GOV

TRACT NO.: 60107

TENTATIVE MAP DATE: 6-29-09

EXHIBIT MAP DATE: 6-29-09

STORM DRAIN AND HYDROLOGY SECTION CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, PHONE: (626) 458-4921

Prior to Improvement Plans Approval:

1. Comply with the requirements of the Drainage Concept/Hydrology Study/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), which was conceptually approved on 1/09/07 to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works.

^{AZ} Name Lizbeth Córdova Date 7/20/09 Phone (626) 458-4921

County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works
GEOTECHNICAL AND MATERIALS ENGINEERING DIVISION
GEOLOGIC REVIEW SHEET
900 So. Fremont Ave., Alhambra, CA 91803
TEL. (626) 458-4925

DISTRIBUTION
_ Geologist
_ Soils Engineer
1 GMED File
1 Subdivision

TENTATIVE PARCEL MAP 60107
SUBDIVIDER David Mak
ENGINEER Engles Shen
GEOLOGIST ---
SOILS ENGINEER ---

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 6/29/09 (Revision)
LOCATION San Gabriel
GRADING BY SUBDIVIDER [Y] (Y or N)
REPORT DATE ---
REPORT DATE ---

TENTATIVE MAP FEASIBILITY IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL FROM A GEOLOGIC STANDPOINT

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION IS APPLICABLE TO THIS DIVISION OF LAND:

- The Final Map does *not* need to be reviewed by GMED.
- Soils engineering reports may be required prior to approval of building or grading plans.
- The Soils Engineering review dated 7/7/09 is attached.

Reviewed by _____


Geir Mathisen

Date 7/7/09

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
GEOTECHNICAL AND MATERIALS ENGINEERING DIVISION

SOILS ENGINEERING REVIEW SHEET

Address: 900 S. Fremont Ave., Alhambra, CA 91803
Telephone: (626) 458-4925
Fax: (626) 458-4913

District Office _____
PCA LX001129
Sheet 1 of 1

Tentative Tract Map 60107
Location Fairview Avenue, San Gabriel
Developer/Owner Mak
Engineer/Architect Engles Shen
Soils Engineer _____
Geologist _____

DISTRIBUTION:
____ Drainage
____ Grading
____ Geo/Soils Central File
____ District Engineer
____ Geologist
____ Soils Engineer
____ Engineer/Architect

Review of:

Tentative Tract Map and Exhibit Dated by Regional Planning 6/29/09 (rev.)
Previous Review Sheet Dated 12/5/08

ACTION:

Tentative Map feasibility is recommended for approval, subject to conditions below:

REMARKS:

1. At the grading plan stage, submit two sets of grading plans to the Soils Section for verification of compliance with County codes and policies.
2. A soils report may be required for review of a grading or building plan. The report must comply with the provisions of "Manual for Preparation of Geotechnical Reports" prepared by County of Los Angeles, Department of Public Works. The Manual is available on the Internet at the following address: <http://ladpw.org/gmed/manual.pdf>



Prepared by _____

Date 7/7/09

Please complete a Customer Service Survey at <http://dpw.lacounty.gov/go/gmedsurvey>.

NOTICE: Public safety, relative to geotechnical subsurface exploration, shall be provided in accordance with current codes for excavations, inclusive of the Los Angeles County Code, Chapter 11.48, and the State of California, Title 8, Construction Safety Orders.
P:\gmepubl\Soils Review\Jeremy\TR 60107, Fairview Avenue, San Gabriel, TTM-A_6.doc

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO GRADING PLAN APPROVAL:

1. Provide approval of:
 - a. The latest drainage concept/hydrology/Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP)/Low Impact Development (LID) plan (if applicable) by the Storm Drain and Hydrology Section of Land Development Division.
 - b. The grading plan by the Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division (GMED).

REQUIREMENTS PRIOR TO FINAL MAP RECORDATION:

5. Submit a grading plan for approval. The grading plan must show and call out the following items, including but not limited to: construction of all drainage devices and details, paved driveways, elevation and drainage of all pads, SUSMP and LID devices (if applicable), and any required landscaping and irrigation not within a common area or maintenance easement. Acknowledgement and/or approval from all easement holders may be required.
6. A maintenance agreement or CC&Rs may be required for all privately maintained drainage devices, slopes, and other facilities.

mde

Name David Esfandi Date 07/16/09 Phone (626) 458-4921

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. Dedicate right of way 30 feet from centerline on Fairview Avenue. Five feet of additional right of way is required along the property frontage.
2. Close any unused driveway with standard curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the property frontage on Fairview Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.
3. Construct a new driveway along the property frontage on Fairview Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.
4. Repair the displaced, broken, or damaged sidewalk along the property frontage on Fairview Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.
5. Remove the existing brick sidewalk and reconstruct sidewalk (adjacent to the curb) including additional sidewalk in the vicinity of the utility poles on Fairview Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Construct additional pop-out in the vicinity of any above ground utilities to meet current ADA requirements to the satisfaction of Public Works.
6. Plant street trees along the property frontage on Fairview Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works.
7. Underground all existing service lines and distribution lines that are less than 50 KV and new utility lines to the satisfaction of Public Works and Southern California Edison. Please contact Construction Division at (626) 458-3129 for new location of any above ground utility structure in the parkway.
8. Comply with the following street lighting requirements:
 - a. Provide street lights on concrete poles with underground wiring on Fairview Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Submit street lighting plans as soon as possible for review and approval to the Street lighting Section of the Traffic and Lighting Division. For additional information, please contact the Street Lighting Section at (626) 300-4726.
 - b. The proposed development is within an existing Lighting District. For acceptance of street light transfer billing, all street lights in the development, or the current phase of the development, must be constructed according to

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 06-29-2009

Public Works approved plans. The contractor shall submit one complete set of "as-built" plans. Provided the above conditions are met, all street lights in the development, or the current phase of the development, have been energized, and the developer has requested a transfer of billing at least by January 1 of the previous year, the Lighting District can assume responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the street lights by July 1 of any given year. The transfer of billing could be delayed one or more years if the above conditions are not met.

8. Prior to map final approval, enter into an agreement with the County franchised cable TV operator (if an area is served) to permit the installation of cable in a common utility trench to the satisfaction of Public Works; or provide documentation that steps to provide cable TV to the proposed subdivision have been initiated to the satisfaction of the Public Works.

PC/MS

Prepared by Patricia Constanza

tr60107r-rev5.doc

Phone (626) 458-4921

Date 07-15-2009

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. The subdivider shall install and dedicate main line sewers and serve each building with a separate house lateral or have approved and bonded sewer plans on file with Public Works.
2. The subdivider shall send a print of the land division map to the County Sanitation District with a request for annexation. The request for annexation must be approved prior to final map approval.
3. Easements are required, subject to review by Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.

HW
Prepared by Tony Khalkhali
tr60107s-rev5.doc

Phone (626) 458-4921

Date 07-16-2009

The subdivision shall conform to the design standards and policies of Public Works, in particular, but not limited to the following items:

1. A water system maintained by the water purveyor, with appurtenant facilities to serve all buildings in the land division, must be provided. The system shall include fire hydrants of the type and location (both on-site and off-site) as determined by the Fire Department. The water mains shall be sized to accommodate the total domestic and fire flows.
2. There shall be filed with Public Works a statement from the water purveyor indicating that the water system will be operated by the purveyor, and that under normal conditions, the system will meet the requirements for the land division, and that water service will be provided to each building.
3. Easements shall be granted to the County, appropriate agency or entity for the purpose of ingress, egress, construction and maintenance of all infrastructures constructed for this land division to the satisfaction of Public Works.
4. Submit landscape and irrigation plans for each open space in the land division, with landscape area greater than 2,500 square feet, in accordance with the Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance.

HW

Prepared by Lana Radle
tr60107w-rev5.doc

Phone (626) 458-4921

Date 07-17-2009

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

FIRE DEPARTMENT

5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040



CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBDIVISION - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision: TR 60107 Map Date June 29, 2009 - Ex. A

C.U.P. _____ Vicinity Map 0170A

- FIRE DEPARTMENT HOLD on the tentative map shall remain until verification from the Los Angeles County Fire Dept. Planning Section is received, stating adequacy of service. Contact (323) 881-2404.
- Access shall comply with Title 21 (County of Los Angeles Subdivision Code) and Section 902 of the Fire Code, which requires all weather access. All weather access may require paving.
- Fire Department access shall be extended to within 150 feet distance of any exterior portion of all structures.
- Where driveways extend further than 300 feet and are of single access design, turnarounds suitable for fire protection equipment use shall be provided and shown on the final map. Turnarounds shall be designed, constructed and maintained to insure their integrity for Fire Department use. Where topography dictates, turnarounds shall be provided for driveways that extend over 150 feet in length.
- The private driveways shall be indicated on the final map as "Private Driveway and Firelane" with the widths clearly depicted. Driveways shall be maintained in accordance with the Fire Code.
- Vehicular access must be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction to all required fire hydrants. All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted prior to construction.
- This property is located within the area described by the Fire Department as "Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone" (formerly Fire Zone 4). A "Fuel Modification Plan" shall be submitted and approved prior to final map clearance. (Contact: Fuel Modification Unit, Fire Station #32, 605 North Angeleno Avenue, Azusa, CA 91702-2904, Phone (626) 969-5205 for details).
- Provide Fire Department or City approved street signs and building access numbers prior to occupancy.
- Additional fire protection systems shall be installed in lieu of suitable access and/or fire protection water.
- The final concept map, which has been submitted to this department for review, has fulfilled the conditions of approval recommended by this department for access only.
- These conditions must be secured by a C.U.P. and/or Covenant and Agreement approved by the County of Los Angeles Fire Department prior to final map clearance.
- The Fire Department has no additional requirements for this division of land.

Comments: Access as shown on the Exhibit Map is adequate. No gates are accepted for this project.

By Inspector: Juan C. Padilla Date November 16, 2009



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

FIRE DEPARTMENT

5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

WATER SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision No. TR 60107 Tentative Map Date June 29, 2009 - Ex. A

Revised Report yes

The County Forester and Fire Warden is prohibited from setting requirements for water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows as a condition of approval for this division of land as presently zoned and/or submitted. However, water requirements may be necessary at the time of building permit issuance.

The required fire flow for public fire hydrants at this location is ___ gallons per minute at 20 psi for a duration of ___ hours, over and above maximum daily domestic demand. ___ Hydrant(s) flowing simultaneously may be used to achieve the required fire flow.

The required fire flow for private on-site hydrants is 1250 gallons per minute at 20 psi. Each private on-site hydrant must be capable of flowing 1250 gallons per minute at 20 psi with two hydrants flowing simultaneously, one of which must be the furthest from the public water source.

Fire hydrant requirements are as follows:

Install ___ public fire hydrant(s). Verify / Upgrade existing ___ public fire hydrant(s).

Install 1 private on-site fire hydrant(s).

All hydrants shall measure 6"x 4"x 2-1/2" brass or bronze, conforming to current AWWA standard C503 or approved equal. All on-site hydrants shall be installed a minimum of 25' feet from a structure or protected by a two (2) hour rated firewall.

Location: As per map on file with the office.

Other location: ___

The required fire hydrant shall be installed, tested and accepted prior to construction. Vehicular access shall be provided and maintained serviceable throughout construction.

The County of Los Angeles Fire Department is not setting requirements for water mains, fire hydrants and fire flows as a condition of approval for this division of land as presently zoned and/or submitted.

Additional water system requirements will be required when this land is further subdivided and/or during the building permit process.

Hydrants and fire flows are adequate to meet current Fire Department requirements.

Upgrade not necessary, if existing hydrant(s) meet(s) fire flow requirements. Submit original water availability form to our office.

Comments: Due to the distance of the existing PUBLIC fire hydrant and the depth of the lot, a private fire hydrant is required to be installed between Unit 8 and Unit 9. Indicate compliance on the architectural plans during the building plan check process prior to building permit issuance.

Per Pasadena Water and Power fire flow test conducted on 04-08-09, the existing PUBLIC fire hydrant is adequate.

All hydrants shall be installed in conformance with Title 20, County of Los Angeles Government Code and County of Los Angeles Fire Code, or appropriate city regulations. This shall include minimum six-inch diameter mains. Arrangements to meet these requirements must be made with the water purveyor serving the area.

By Inspector Juan C. Padilla Date November 16, 2009



**LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**



PARK OBLIGATION REPORT

Tentative Map #	60107	DRP Map Date:	06/29/2009	SCM Date:	/ /	Report Date:	07/14/2009
Park Planning Area #	42	WEST SAN GABRIEL VALLEY				Map Type:	REV. (REV RECD)

Total Units = Proposed Units + Exempt Units

Sections 21.24.340, 21.24.350, 21.28.120, 21.28.130, and 21.28.140, the County of Los Angeles Code, Title 21, Subdivision Ordinance provide that the County will determine whether the development's park obligation is to be met by:

- 1) the dedication of land for public or private park purpose or,
- 2) the payment of in-lieu fees or,
- 3) the provision of amenities or any combination of the above.

The specific determination of how the park obligation will be satisfied will be based on the conditions of approval by the advisory agency as recommended by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

Park land obligation in acres or in-lieu fees:

ACRES:	0.06
IN-LIEU FEES:	\$24,125

Conditions of the map approval:

The park obligation for this development will be met by:

The payment of \$24,125 in-lieu fees.

Trails:

No trails.

Comments:

Proposed 10 detached residential condominium units, with credit for 3 existing houses to be removed; net increase of 7 units.

*****Advisory: the Representative Land Values (RLVs) in Los Angeles County Code (LACC) Section 21.28.140 are used to calculate park fees and are adjusted annually, based on changes in the Consumer Price Index. The new RLVs become effective July 1st of each year and may apply to this subdivision map if first advertised for hearing before either a hearing officer or the Regional Planning Commission on or after July 1st pursuant to LACC Section 21.28.140, subsection 3. Accordingly, the park fee in this report is subject to change depending upon when the subdivision is first advertised for public hearing.**

Please contact Clement Lau at (213) 351-5120 or Sheela Mathai at (213) 351-5121, Department of Parks and Recreation, 510 South Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90020 for further information or to schedule an appointment to make an in-lieu fee payment.

For information on Hiking and Equestrian Trail requirements, please contact the Trails Coordinator at (213) 351-5135.

By: James Barber
James Barber, Developer Obligations/Land Acquisitions

Supv D 5th
July 14, 2009 16:27:57
QMB02F.FRX



**LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**



PARK OBLIGATION WORKSHEET

Tentative Map #	60107	DRP Map Date:	06/29/2009	SMC Date:	/ /	Report Date:	07/14/2009
Park Planning Area #	42	WEST SAN GABRIEL VALLEY				Map Type:	REV. (REV RECD)

The formula for calculating the acreage obligation and or In-lieu fee is as follows:

(P)people x (0.003) Goal x (U)nits = (X) acres obligation

(X) acres obligation x RLV/Acre = In-Lieu Base Fee

- Where: P = Estimate of number of People per dwelling unit according to the type of dwelling unit as determined by the 2000 U.S. Census*. Assume * people for detached single-family residences; Assume * people for attached single-family (townhouse) residences, two-family residences, and apartment houses containing fewer than five dwelling units; Assume * people for apartment houses containing five or more dwelling units; Assume * people for mobile homes.
- Goal = The subdivision ordinance allows for the goal of 3.0 acres of park land for each 1,000 people generated by the development. This goal is calculated as "0.0030" in the formula.
- U = Total approved number of Dwelling Units.
- X = Local park space obligation expressed in terms of acres.
- RLV/Acre = Representative Land Value per Acre by Park Planning Area.

Total Units = Proposed Units + Exempt Units


	People*	Goal 3.0 Acres / 1000 People	Number of Units	Acre Obligation
Detached S.F. Units	2.98	0.0030	7	0.06
M.F. < 5 Units	3.23	0.0030	0	0.00
M.F. >= 5 Units	2.40	0.0030	0	0.00
Mobile Units	2.35	0.0030	0	0.00
Exempt Units			3	
Total Acre Obligation =				0.06

Park Planning Area = **42 WEST SAN GABRIEL VALLEY**

Goal	Acre Obligation	RLV / Acre	In-Lieu Base Fee
@(0.0030)	0.06	\$402,088	\$24,125

Lot #	Provided Space	Provided Acres	Credit (%)	Acre Credit	Land
None					
Total Provided Acre Credit:				0.00	

Acre Obligation	Public Land Crdt.	Prv. Land Crdt.	Net Obligation	RLV / Acre	In-Lieu Fee Due
0.06	0.00	0.00	0.06	\$402,088	\$24,125



JONATHAN E. FIELDING, M.D., M.P.H.
Director and Health Officer

JONATHAN E. FREEDMAN
Chief Deputy Director

ANGELO J. BELLOMO, REHS
Director of Environmental Health

ALFONSO MEDINA, REHS
Director of Environmental Protection Bureau

KEN HABARADAS, MS, REHS
Acting Environmental Health Staff Specialist
5050 Commerce Drive
Baldwin Park, California 91706
TEL (626) 430-5280 • FAX (626) 960-2740



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Gloria Molina
First District
Mark Ridley-Thomas
Second District
Zev Yaroslavsky
Third District
Don Knabe
Fourth District
Michael D. Antonovich
Fifth District

July 22, 2009

RFS No. 09-0018098

Tract Map No. 060107

Vicinity: San Gabriel

Tentative Tract Map Date: June 29, 2009 (5th Revision)

- Public Health recommends approval of this project.
 Public Health does **NOT** recommend approval of this project.

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Health has no objection to this subdivision and **Vesting Tentative Tract Map 060107** is cleared for public hearing. The following conditions still apply and are in force:

1. Potable water will be supplied by the **East Pasadena Water Company**, a public water company.
2. Sewage disposal will be provided through the public sewer and wastewater treatment facilities of the **Los Angeles County Sanitation District #15** as proposed.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at (626) 430-5262.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ken Habaradas", with a large circular flourish at the end.

Ken Habaradas, MS, REHS
Bureau of Environmental Protection

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER No. OTP 03-211 / TR60107

1. DESCRIPTION:

A request to develop a 3-parcel property with ten (10) condominium units. Two of the units will have a two-car garage and the remaining units will have a three-car garage. In addition, 18 guest parking spaces will be provided. The project site currently contains three single family residences with two-car garages, these structures will be demolished. The project request also includes an Oak Tree Permit to remove one oak tree and encroach into the protected zone of five others.

2. LOCATION:

8831, 8843, and 8845 Fairview Avenue, San Gabriel, CA 91775

3. PROPONENT:

Fairview Venture, LLC
802 East Mission Road
San Gabriel, CA 91776

4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:

BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

5. LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:

THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: Impact Analysis Section, Department of Regional Planning

DATE: November 10, 2009

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: 03-211

CASES: TR 60107

OTP



**** INITIAL STUDY ****

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING**

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: June 25, 2009

Staff Member: Michele Bush

Thomas Guide: 566 H-7

USGS Quad: Mt. Wilson

Location: 8831, 8835 & 8843 Fairview Avenue

Description of Project: A request to develop a 3-parcel property with ten (10) condominium units. Two of the units will have a two-car garage and the remaining units will have a three-car garage. In addition, 18 guest parking spaces will be provided. The project site currently contains three single family residences with two-car garages, these structures will be demolished. The project request also includes an Oak Tree Permit to remove one oak tree and encroach into the protected zone of five others.

Gross Area: approx. 1.31 acres

Environmental Setting: The project site is located within the County's unincorporated area known as East San Gabriel and is south of Huntington Drive, east of Muscatel Avenue, west of Rosemead Blvd. and north of Duarte Road. The site contains six oak trees and is within an urbanized area. Surrounding land uses consist of single family residential uses.

Zoning: R-A-5,000 (East Pasadena-San Gabriel Community Standards District)

General Plan: 1-Low Density Residential (1 to 6 du/ac)

Community/Area Wide Plan: (East Pasadena-San Gabriel Community Standards District)

Major projects in area:

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Description & Status</u>
<u>PM 061232</u>	<u>1 single family lot w/3 single family units on 0.4 acre; approved</u>
<u>PM 070129</u>	<u>1 condo lot w/3 units; pending</u>
<u>PM 067164</u>	<u>3 single family lots on 0.36 acre; pending</u>

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- None
- Regional Water Quality Control Board
 - Los Angeles Region
 - Lahontan Region
- Coastal Commission
- Army Corps of Engineers
- _____

Trustee Agencies

- None
- State Fish and Game
- State Parks
- _____
- _____

Special Reviewing Agencies

- None
- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- National Parks
- National Forest
- Edwards Air Force Base
- Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mtns.
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

Regional Significance

- None
- SCAG Criteria
- Air Quality
- Water Resources
- Santa Monica Mtns Area
- _____

County Reviewing Agencies

- Subdivision Committee
- DPW: _____
- Health Services: _____
- _____
- _____

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)			
		Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
		Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation			
		Potentially Significant Impact			
		Potential Concern			
CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Flood	6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Fire	7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Noise	8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Air Quality	10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Biota	11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	4. Cultural Resources	12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Mineral Resources	13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	7. Visual Qualities	15	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Education	18	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	5. Utilities	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
OTHER	1. General	21	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Environmental Safety	22	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Land Use	23	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Mandatory Findings	25	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Oak trees

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.


An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, inasmuch as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant."

At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: Michele Bush  Date: 11/18/09

Approved by: Paul McCarthy  Date: 11-12-09

Determination appealed--see attached sheet.

This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? <u>1000 feet south from Liquefaction area (Seismic Hazard Zones, Mt. Wilson Quad); Adjacent to Special Studies Zone boundary but 1000 feet south from potentially active fault.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
_____ |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size Project Design Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

Comply with all SCM requirements from Public Works.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
<hr/> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
<hr/> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
<hr/> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off?
<hr/> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
<hr/> |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? <hr/> |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Section 308A Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)
 Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design

Comply with all SCM requirements from Public Works.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
<i>During construction period</i>
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- Noise Ordinance No. 11,778 Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design Compatible Use
- _____

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
_____ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations or is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies?

<i>Project will need NPDES permit.</i>
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies?

<i>Project will need NPDES permit.</i>
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- Industrial Waste Permit Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5
 Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Lot Size Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **water quality** problems?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)? |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use? |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook? |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project 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)? |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors: _____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

Health and Safety Code Section 40506

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Project Design

Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **air quality**?

Potentially significant

Less than significant with project mitigation

Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?

_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?

_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?

_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)?

_____ |
| e. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?

<i>Oak trees</i>
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?

_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? _____

_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Lot Size
 Project Design
 Oak Tree Permit
 ERB/SEATAC Review

Comply with all recommendations from County Forester.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **biotic resources**?

- Potentially significant
 Less than significant with project mitigation
 Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Lot Size Project Design Phase I Archaeology Report
- _____
- _____

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical, or paleontological** resources?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5.Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project 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?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project 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?
<hr/> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
<hr/> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
<hr/> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? <hr/> <hr/> |

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Lot Size Project Design
-
-
-
-

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **agriculture** resources?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

Yes No Maybe

- a. Yes No Maybe
Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed?

- b. Yes No Maybe
Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?

- c. Yes No Maybe
Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? _____
- d. Yes No Maybe
Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?

- e. Yes No Maybe
Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?

- f. Yes No Maybe
Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration): _____

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size Project Design Visual Report Compatible Use
- _____
- _____

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Project Design Traffic Report Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division
- _____
- _____

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **traffic/access** factors?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?

- b. Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?

- c. Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

- Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130
- Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create student transportation problems?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Site Dedication Government Code Section 65995 Library Facilities Mitigation Fee
- _____

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- Yes No Maybe
- a. Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?

- b. Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?

- c. Other factors? _____

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Fire Mitigation Fees

Closest fire station is located near the intersection of Duarte Rd and Rosemead Blvd, which is approximately 0.25 miles from the site. Closest sheriff station is located on 8838 East Las Tunas Drive, Temple City, which is approximately 1.68 miles from the site.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells?
<hr/> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
<hr/> |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
<hr/> |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
<hr/> |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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 or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)?
<hr/> |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
<hr/> |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot Size Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities/services**?

Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Lot size Project Design Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors? _____

Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project 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 create a significant hazard to the public or environment?
_____ |
| h. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip?
_____ |
| i. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
_____ |
| j. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Toxic Clean up Plan

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

- Potentially significant
 Less than significant with project mitigation
 Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property? <u>Current project proposal exceeds allowable GP density. Staff has request a density recalculation or the project should request to be considered as an infill project.</u> |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
_____ |
| c. | | | | Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria: |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hillside Management Criteria? |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | SEA Conformance Criteria? |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other? _____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project physically divide an established community?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Project will not result in significant impacts on land use in its approved form.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

- | | Yes | No | Maybe | |
|----|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| a. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
_____ |
| b. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?
_____ |
| c. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
_____ |
| d. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
_____ |
| e. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
_____ |
| f. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
_____ |
| g. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other factors? _____
_____ |

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment, or recreational** factors?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE


Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

- Yes No Maybe
- a. Does the project have the potential to substantially 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?
-
- b. Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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.
-
- c. Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?
-

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

- Potentially significant Less than significant with project mitigation Less than significant/No impact



EAST PASADENA WATER COMPANY

3725 E. Mountain View Ave.
Pasadena, CA 91107

Phone: 626-793-6189
Fax: 626-793-0503

Lawrence Morales, Vice President & General Manager

Wayne Goehring, Field Superintendent

Patti Latourelle, Office Manager

March 19, 2009

Director of Public Works
County of Los Angeles
900 South Fremont Avenue
Alhambra, California 91803-1331

Attention: Land Development Division
Water Code Enforcement Subunit

**STATEMENT OF WATER SERVICE FOR: 9139 E. FAIRVIEW AVE., SAN GABRIEL,
CALIFORNIA, 91775 (Parcel Number # 060207)**

This is to certify that the proposed water system to the above referenced property will be operated by this water purveyor.

The proposed water distribution system for the above referenced property will be adequate during normal operating condition to meet the requirements for the water system of this property as provided in Chapter 20.16 of Title 20 of the Los Angeles County Code (Water Code) and as shown on the plans and specifications approved by the Department of Public Works. This includes meeting minimum domestic flow requirements as required by Section 20.16.070 and minimum fire flow and fire hydrant requirements as required by Section 20.16.060.

Sincerely,

Wayne Goehring
Field Superintendent

RESIDENTIAL INFILL BURDEN OF PROOF
for Tract No. 60107

1. The proposed project will not disrupt sound residential neighborhoods nor adversely affect the character of the established community;

The proposed project is located at north of Fairview Ave & west of Lotus Ave in an area that was developed in 1920th, each lot is relatively large but subsequently deeded out into smaller pieces. This project is proposed for ten (10) detached town houses on a parcel of land totaling 57,039 S.F. or 1.309 acres which calculates a density of 7.6 du/ga. Based on a Infill Study, the average density within 500 feet radius of the proposed project is 7.9 du/ga. It proves that the proposed project is to be developed at a density of 7.6 du/ga, 0.3 du/ga below the averaged density in the area; therefore the project will not disrupt the residential neighborhoods nor adversely affect the character of the established community.

2. The proposed project site is of sufficient size to accommodate design features (setbacks, landscaping, buffering, etc.) necessary to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses;

The proposed project site is rectangular in shape with a frontage of 132 feet and 420 feet in depth, design features of the proposed project will satisfy not only the zoning requirements, it will also satisfy the newly created East Pasadena San Gabriel CSD requirements which is more restrictive than the existing development in the surrounding area.

3. The proposed project will not overburden existing public services and facilities;

At the beginning the of the proposed project, it was required to check with all public services and obtained statements of sufficient facilities to serve the entire project.

4. The proposed use will not disrupt or adversely impact local traffic and parking conditions; and

The proposed project is designed to have attached 2-car or 3-car garages for each unit, also provides sufficient guest parking spaces. Fairview Ave. is a typical local street of 36 feet roadway and 60 feet R/W, its anticipated capacity will carry calculated volume of traffic over projected future traffic per L.A.Co.DPW. Development of the proposed project within the guidelines of County Codes will not disrupt or adversely impact local traffic and parking conditions.

5. The proposed project is compatible with surrounding uses in terms of scale, intensity and design.

All design features of the proposed project either meet or beat the current Code requirements which are more restrictive than those of the previous Codes under which the surrounding used were developed. The proposed project is therefore, compatible with surrounding uses in term of scale, intensity and design.

8831 Fairview Ave., San Gabriel
Oak Tree Permit Application
Burden of Proof

03 211

- A. That the proposed construction or proposed use will be accomplished without endangering the health of the remaining trees subject to this Part 16, if any, on the subject property:

The Oak Tree Report cites procedures and precautions to limit the impacts of construction on the five oaks that will remain. It is our hope that these trees will survive the planned construction as a result of following these precautions and the arborist's recommendations.

- B. That the removal of oak tree(s) proposed will not result in soil erosion through the diversion or increased flow of surface waters which can not be satisfactorily mitigated:

Soil erosion will be prevented on site during construction by using standard best management practices. The site is relatively flat, and the removal of one oak tree will not have a substantial effect on the potential for erosion on this site.

- C. That in addition to the above facts at least one of the follow findings apply:
- 1.a. Alternate development plans cannot achieve the same permitted density.
 - b. Placement of such tree precludes the reasonable and efficient use of such property for a use otherwise authorized.

MAJOR LAND DIVISION VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 060107

IN THE UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY OF THE
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 85 OF TRACT NO. 4850, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN
BOOK 52 PAGES 11 AND 12 OF MAPS, AND A PORTION OF SANTA ANITA RANCHO
AS RECORDED IN BOOK 1 PAGES 97 AND 98 OF PATENTS RECORDS, BOTH IN THE
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

FOR CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES

PROJECT ADDRESS:
8831-8843 FAIRVIEW AVE
SAN GABRIEL, CA 91775
APN: 5379-008-038,037,038

OWNER/SUBDIVIDER:
DAVID MAK
1363 VIRGINIA RD
SAN MARINO, CA 91108

PREPARED BY:
ENGLES SHEN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
1111 CORPORATE CENTER DR., #302
MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754
TEL: (323) 286-0868 FAX: (323) 286-0867


NOTES:
GENERAL PLAN CTG. EXIST. 1
ZONE: EXIST. RA-5000
LOT SIZE: 53,080 S.F. (1.22 AC NET)
57,039 S.F. (1.31 AC GROSS)
EXISTING LAND USE: 3 SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSES
PROPOSED LAND USE: 10 DETACHED CONDOMINIUM UNITS
AVERAGE DENSITY: 7.9
PROPOSED DENSITY: 7.8
NO. OF PARKINGS: 23
UNITS 1 TO 5, 7, 8: 2 CAR GARAGE
UNITS 6 TO 9, 10: 3 CAR GARAGE
NO. OF GUEST PARKINGS: 10
OVER FLOW TURFBLOCK PARKING: 8
6 OAK TREES ON SITE. (1 REMOVE, 5 ENCROACHMENT)
OAK TREE PERMIT: 03-211
SEWER: PUBLIC
WATER: PUBLIC
DRAINAGE: GRAVITY FLOW TO STREET
REMOVE ALL EXIST. BUILDINGS
REMOVE ALL EXIST. TREES, EXCEPT AS NOTED
BENCH MARK: SPK. AT C/L INT. FAIRVIEW AV/LOTUS AV.
ELEV. = 100.00 (ASSUMED)

EARTH WORK:
CUT = 155 YARDS, FILL=664 YARDS
NET = 509 YARDS IMPORT


**EAST PASADENA - SAN GABRIEL
CSD REQUIREMENTS:**

FRONT YARD SETBACK SURVEY			
ADDRESS	AS OF JAN, 2004	AS OF MAR, 2009	REMARKS
7103 LOTUS	7'	18'	FRONT YARD SETBACKS BASED ON 1/2 STREET WIDTH OF 30'
8845	—	57'	
8843	15'	15'	
8835	28'	28'	
8827	38'	22'	
8817	12'	24'	
8815	41'	31'	
8809	19'	31'	
TOTAL	158'	224'	
NO. OF HSE	7	6	



AVERAGE LOT WIDTH: 127.74'
AVERAGE FRONT YARD SETBACK:
158/7 = 22.86' AS OF 1/2004
224/8 = 28' AS OF 3/2009
TOTAL BLDG. AREA: 26,384 S.F.
FLOOR AREA RATIO: 26,384/53,080 = 49.71%
(MAX. ALLOWABLE = 50%)
BLDG. COVERAGE:
FOOTPRINT 1ST FLR.: 12,580 S.F.
GARAGE: 4,808 S.F.
TOTAL: 17,388 S.F.
LOT COVERAGE: 17,388/53,080 = 32.18%
(MAX. ALLOWABLE = 50%)
FRONT YARD LANDSCAPE: 2,379 S.F.
FRONT YARD AREA: 2,992 S.F.
RATIO: 2,379/2,992 = 80%
(MIN. ALLOWABLE = 50%)



REVISED JUNE, 2009
JUNE, 2003



SCALE: 1"=30'



EASEMENT NOTE:

1. L.J. ROSE HOLDER OF AN ESMT. FOR WATER PIPE ESMT BY DEED REC. IN BK 161, PAGE 201 OF DEEDS, SAID ESMT IS BLANK IN NATURE.
2. CITY OF PASADENA HOLDER OF AN ESMT FOR WATER MAIN AND CONNECTION BY DEED REC. 3/10/1927 IN BK 4770, PAGE 134 AND REC. 7/1/1931 IN BK 10906, PAGE 345 AND 4/8/1943 IN BK 19623, PAGE 178. ALL OF O.R.
3. FOR WATER CONDUITS AND PIPES REC. IN BK 575, PAGE 248 OF DEEDS.
4. AN EASEMENT FOR SEWER BY DEED REC. 5/25/1961 AS INST. NO. 4553 IN BK D1233, PAGE 552, O.R.

EXHIBIT MAJOR LAND DIVISION VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT NO. 060107

IN THE UNINCORPORATED TERRITORY OF THE
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

BEING A SUBDIVISION OF LOT 85 OF TRACT NO. 4850, AS PER MAP RECORDED IN
BOOK 52 PAGES 11 AND 12 OF MAPS, AND A PORTION OF SANTA ANITA RANCHO
AS RECORDED IN BOOK 1 PAGES 97 AND 98 OF PATENTS RECORDS, BOTH IN THE
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY RECORDER OF SAID COUNTY.

FOR CONDOMINIUM PURPOSES

PROJECT ADDRESS:
8831-8843 FAIRVIEW AVE
SAN GABRIEL, CA 91775
APH: 5379-008-036,037,038

OWNER/SUBDIVIDER:
DAVID MAK
1383 VIRGINIA RD
SAN MARINO, CA 91108

PREPARED BY:
SINGLES SHEN & ASSOCIATES, INC.
1111 CORPORATE CENTER DR., #302
MONTEREY PARK, CA 91754
TEL: (323) 266-0866 FAX: (323) 266-0867

NOTES:
GENERAL PLAN CTG. EXIST. 1
ZONE : EXIST. RA-5000
LOT SIZE : 53,080 S.F. (1.22 AC NET)
57,039 S.F. (1.31 AC GROSS)
EXISTING LAND USE : 3 SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSES
PROPOSED LAND USE : 10 DETACHED CONDOMINIUM UNITS
AVERAGE DENSITY : 7.9
PROPOSED DENSITY : 7.6
NO. OF PARINGS : 23
UNITS 1 TO 5,7,8 : 2 CAR GARAGE
UNITS 6 TO 9,10 : 3 CAR GARAGE
NO. OF GUEST PARKINGS : 10
OVER FLOW TURFBLOCK PARKING : 8
6 OAK TREES ON SITE. (1 REMOVE, 5 ENCROACHMENT)
OAK TREE PERMIT : 03-211
SEWER : PUBLIC
WATER : PUBLIC
DRAINAGE : GRAVITY FLOW TO STREET
REMOVE ALL EXIST. BUILDINGS
REMOVE ALL EXIST. TREES, EXCEPT AS NOTED
BENCH MARK: SPK. AT C/L INT. FAIRVIEW AV/LOTUS AV.
ELEV. = 100.00 (ASSUMED)

EARTH WORK:
CUT = 155 YARDS, FILL=884 YARDS
NET = 509 YARDS IMPORT

**EAST PASADENA - SAN GABRIEL
CSD REQUIREMENTS:**


FRONT YARD SETBACK SURVEY			
ADDRESS	AS OF JAN, 2004	AS OF MAR, 2009	REMARKS
7103 LOTUS	7'	16'	FRONT YARD SETBACKS BASED ON 1/2 STREET WIDTH OF 30'
8845	--	57'	
8843	15'	15'	
8835	28'	28'	
8827	36'	22'	
8817	12'	24'	
8815	41'	31'	
8809	18'	31'	
TOTAL	158'	224'	
NO. OF HSE	7	8	

AVERAGE LOT WIDTH: 127.74'
AVERAGE FRONT YARD SETBACK: 158/7 = 22.60' AS OF 1/2004
224/8 = 28' AS OF 3/2009




TOTAL BLDG. AREA: 26,384 S.F.
FLOOR AREA RATIO: 26,384/53,080 = 49.71%
(MAX. ALLOWABLE = 50%)

BLDG. COVERAGE:
FOOTPRINT 1ST FLR : 12,580 S.F.
GARAGE : 4,708 S.F.
TOTAL : 17,088 S.F.
LOT COVERAGE: 17,088/53,080 = 32.16%
(MAX. ALLOWABLE = 50%)

FRONT YARD LANDSCAPE: 2,379 S.F.
FRONT YARD AREA: 2,992 S.F.
RATIO: 2,379/2,992 = 80%
(MIN. ALLOWABLE = 50%)



REVISED JUNE, 2009
JUNE, 2003



- EASEMENT NOTE:**
1. L.J. ROSE HOLDER OF AN ESM'T. FOR WATER PIPE ESM'T BY DEED REC. IN BK 161, PAGE 281 OF DEEDS. SAID ESM'T IS IN NATURE.
 2. CITY OF PASADENA HOLDER OF AN ESM'T FOR WATER MAIN AND CONNECTION BY DEED REC. 3/10/1927 IN BK 4770, PAGE 134 AND REC. 7/1/1931 IN BK 10908, PAGE 345 AND 8/5/1943 IN BK 19923, PAGE 179. ALL OF OUR OWN WATER CONDUITS AND PIPES. REC'D IN BK 375, PAGE 246 OF DEEDS.
 3. AN EASEMENT FOR SEWER BY DEED REC. 5/25/1961 AS INST. NO. 4553 IN BK D1233, PAGE 552, O.R.
 4. EASEMENT FOR WATER LINE RESERVED IN DEED REC. 3-10-1927 AS INST. NO. 399 IN BOOK 4770-134, O.R. AND 7-31-1931 AS INST. NO. 28 IN BOOK 10908-345, O.R.