Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

Jon Sanabria
Acting Director of Planning

December 2, 2009

TO: Librarian
La Puente Library
15920 East Central Avenue
La Puente, CA 91744

FROM: Ramon Cordova
Senior Regional Planning Assistant
Department of Regional Planning
320 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, California 90012

SUBJECT: PROJECT NO. 01-157-(4)
REVISED VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 53605

Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605 is scheduled for a Public Hearing before the Los Angeles County Hearing Officer on January 5, 2010.

Please have the materials listed below be available to the public.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call the Land Divisions Section of the Department of Regional Planning at (213) 974-6433.

Thank you.

Attachments:
1. Copy of Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605 and Exhibit Map dated May 26, 2009
2. Land Use Map
3. Notice of Public Hearing
4. Draft Factual
5. Draft Staff Report
6 Draft Findings
7. Draft Reports/Recommendations
8. Environmental Documents

Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

Jon Sanabria
Acting Director of Planning

NOTICE OF REQUEST FOR MINOR MODIFICATION TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT CASE NO. 01-157

Notice is hereby given that the project applicant has requested to modify a condition of approval to previously approved Conditional Use Permit No. 01-157. The Los Angeles County Hearing Officer approved associated Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605 and the associated Conditional Use Permit No. 01-157 and Parking Permit Case No. 200600018 on December 19, 2006. That approval authorized a vesting tentative tract map to create one multi-family lot with six new detached condominium units, conditional use permit to ensure compliance with the existing Development Program zone and authorize modification to the proposed project for the minimum distance of 10 feet between buildings to allow a distance of eight feet between buildings and a parking permit to allow less than required guest parking from two spaces to no guest parking spaces. **(See other side of notice for information on separate but associated proposed Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605).**

Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") Section 22.56.1600 *et seq.* (Conditional Use Permits — Modifications or Elimination of Conditions) authorizes the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning Director ("Director of Planning") to consider requests for modification or elimination of certain conditions of a previously approved conditional use permit where such modification or elimination of conditions will not result in a substantial alteration or material deviation from the terms and conditions of the previously approved conditional use permit, and is necessary to allow the reasonable operation and use previously granted. The project applicant has requested to modify Condition No. 13 of the approved Conditional Use Permit. The modification request consists of allowing grading amounts consisting of 98 cubic yards of cut and 198 cubic yards of fill with an additional 100 cubic yards of imported fill not depicted on the approved vesting tentative tract map.

The condition, ***as currently approved,*** read as follows:

13. The subject property shall be graded, developed and maintained in substantial compliance with the approved vesting tentative tract map dated April 6, 2006. An amended or revised tentative tract map approved for Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605 may, at the discretion of the Director of Regional Planning, constitute a revised Exhibit "A". All revised plans shall require the written authorization of the property owner.

With the requested modification, the applicant is adding the following to Condition No. 13, and it would read as follows:

13. The subject property shall be graded consisting of 98 cubic yards of cut and 198 cubic yards of fill with an additional 100 cubic yards of imported fill, developed and maintained in substantial compliance with the approved revised vesting tentative tract map dated May 26, 2009. An amended or revised tentative tract map approved for Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605 may, at the discretion of the Director of Regional Planning, constitute a revised Exhibit "A". All revised plans shall require the written authorization of the property owner.

LOCATION OF SUBJECT PROPERTY: The subject property is located at the southeast corner of Clark Avenue and Kinbrae Avenue in the Hacienda Heights Zoned District of Los Angeles County.

This request does not affect the zoning of surrounding property. Any person may oppose the granting of this request by submitting a written protest to the Director of Planning within 15 days after receipt of this notice. Such protest letters should be mailed c/o Director of Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1382, Los Angeles, California 90012. If more than one written protest to approval of the modification request is received the modification request will be denied. If not more than one written protest is received the modification will be approved by a Hearing Officer provided the burden of proof has been met, and notice of the approval will be sent to any person who filed a written protest.

Case materials are available for review between 7:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday **(closed on Fridays)** in the offices of the Department of Regional Planning, Hall of Records, Room 1382, 320 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012.

Additional information concerning this request may be obtained by telephoning Mr. Ramon Cordova at (213) 974-6433 between 7:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday. **Our offices are closed on Fridays.** Callers from North County areas may dial (661) 272-0964 (Antelope Valley) or (661) 253-0111 (Santa Clarita) toll free and then request a connection to 974-6443.

Esta noticia es para dar notificacion que el aplicante de este proyecto propone modificar condiciones las cuales fueron impuestas cuando se aprovo este proyecto bajo el Permiso de Uso Condicional Numero 01-157. Se ha pedido una modificacion a la condición del permiso de uso condicional el permiso para permitir modificación de terreno en las cantidades de 98 yardas cúbicas del corte y 198 yardas cúbicas de se llenan de unas 100 yardas cúbicas adicionales de importado se llenan La condicion que se ha pedido modificar es la condicion número 13. Si necesita mas informacion o si quiere este aviso en Espanol favor llamar al Departamento de Planificacion al (213) 974-6466.

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

PROJECT No. 01-157-(4)
REVISED VESTING TRACT MAP NO. 53605

RPC/**HO** MEETING DATE	CONTINUE TO
AGENDA ITEM	
PUBLIC HEARING DATE January 5, 2010	

APPLICANT	**OWNER**	**REPRESENTATIVE**
Day 1 Development Corporation	Day 1 Development Corporation	Tritech Associates, Inc

REQUEST
Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map: To allow grading amounts of 98 cubic yards of cut and 198 cubic yards of fill with an additional 100 cubic yards of imported fill. Project previously approved for one multi-family lot with six new detached condominium units on 0.52 acres (gross).

LOCATION/ADDRESS
Southeast corner of Clark Avenue and Kinbrae Avenue

ACCESS
Kinbrae Avenue south of Clark Avenue

ZONED DISTRICT
Hacienda Heights

COMMUNITY
Hacienda Heights

EXISTING ZONING
R-3-21U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence-5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area-21 Dwelling Units Per Net Acre-Development Program)

SIZE	**EXISTING LAND USE**	**SHAPE**	**TOPOGRAPHY**
0.52 gross acres 0.36 net acres	Unimproved	Rectangular	Level

SURROUNDING LAND USES & ZONING

North: Industrial/City of Industry	**East:** Commercial / C-1(Restricted Business)
South: Single-Family Residence/A-1-6,000 (Light Agricultural-6,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area)	**West:** Commercial/C-1

GENERAL PLAN	**DESIGNATION**	**MAXIMUM DENSITY**	**CONSISTENCY**
Hacienda Heights Community General Plan	Urban 4 (Medium High Density 12.1-22 DU/AC)	11 DU	Yes

ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS
Addendum to Negative Declaration

DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLAN
The proposed Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605 ("TR 53605"), dated May 26, 2009, depicts grading amounts of 98 cubic yards of cut and 198 cubic yards of fill with an additional 100 cubic yards of imported fill not depicted on the vesting tentative map, dated April 6, 2006 approved by the Los Angeles County Hearing Officer on December 19, 2006.

KEY ISSUES
- Applicant is requesting approval of Revised TR 53605 to allow grading in order to continue development of project site consisting of one multi-family lot with six new detached condominium units. No other change is proposed to project design and layout.

(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)		

DRAFT

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 _Curbs and Gutters Street Lights _Street Trees __Inverted Shoulder _Sidewalks __Off Site __Paving

☐ Water Mains and Hydrants

☐ Drainage Facilities

☐ Sewer ☐ Septic Tanks ☐ Other _____

☒ Park Dedication "In-Lieu Fee"

ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

The applicant is proposing a separate but associated modification to Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-157 to allow grading consisting of 98 cubic yards of cut and 198 cubic yards of fill with an additional 100 cubic yards of imported fill not depicted on the approved vesting tentative tract map. This is a Director's Review process and will not be considered with Revised TR 53605.

Vesting Tentative Tract Map 53605 (TR53605), approved by the Los Angeles County Hearing Officer on December 19, 2006. The previously approved TR53605 consisted of one multi-family lot with six new detached condominium units on 0.52 acres (gross). Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-157 was also approved to ensure compliance with the existing Development Program zone and authorized modification to the proposed project for the minimum distance of 10 feet between buildings to allow a distance of eight feet between buildings; and Parking Permit Case No. 200600018 to allow less than required guest parking from two spaces to no guest spaces.

Prepared by: Ramon Cordova

DRAFT

PROJECT NO. 01-157-(4)
REVISED VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 53605

STAFF REPORT

JANUARY 5, 2010 HEARING OFFICER PUBLIC HEARING

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The current project is proposing Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605 ("TR 53605"). The project was originally approved by the Hearing Officer of Los Angeles County on December 19, 2006, for one multi-family lot with six new detached condominium units on 0.52 acres (gross). The revised project proposes to include grading amounts of 98 cubic yards of cut and 198 cubic yards of fill with an additional 100 cubic yards of imported fill.

The applicant is proposing a separate but associated modification to Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-157 ("CUP") to allow grading consisting of 98 cubic yards of cut and 198 cubic yards of fill with an additional 100 cubic yards of imported fill not depicted on the approved vesting tentative tract map. This is a Director's Review process and will not be considered with Revised TR 53605.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT PROPERTY

Location: The project site is located at the southeast corner of Clark Avenue and Kinbrae Avenue, in the Hacienda Heights Zoned District within the unincorporated community of Hacienda Heights.

Physical Features: The subject property is approximately 0.52 gross acres in size and comprised of one lot. The property is rectangular in shape with level terrain.

Access: The property has frontage on Kinbrae Avenue, a 60-foot-wide public street.

Services: Domestic water service will be provided by the San Gabriel Valley Water Company. Domestic sewer service will be provided by the Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 15. The project is within the boundaries of the Hacienda-La Puente Unified School District.

ENTITLEMENTS REQUESTED

Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map: The applicant requests approval of Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605 to allow proposed grading consisting of 98 cubic yards of cut and 198 cubic yards of fill with an additional 100 cubic yards of imported fill. The previous Vesting Tentative Tract Map proposed no grading.

EXISTING ZONING

Subject Property: The subject property is zoned R-3-21U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence – 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area - 21 Dwelling Units per Net Acre - Development Program).

Surrounding Properties: Surrounding zoning is C-1 (Restricted Business) to the east and west; A-1-6,000 (Light Agricultural - 6,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area) to the south and the City of Industry to the north.

DRAFT

EXISTING LAND USES

Subject Property: The subject property consists of one unimproved lot.

Surrounding Properties: Surrounding uses are as follows:
North: City of Industry;
East: Commercial buildings;
South: Single-family residences; and
West: Commercial buildings

PREVIOUS CASE/ZONING HISTORY

TR 53605, CUP and Parking Permit Case No. 200600018 ("PKP") were approved by the Hearing Officer on December 19, 2006. The previously approved TR53605 consisted of one multi-family lot with six new detached condominium units on 0.52 acres (gross). CUP No. 01-157 was also approved to ensure compliance with the existing Development Program zone and authorized modification to the proposed project for the minimum distance of 10 feet between buildings to allow a distance of eight feet between buildings; and PKP to allow less than required guest parking from two spaces to no guest spaces.

Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-156-(4) ("CUP 01-156") was approved by the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission on February 6, 2002. This permit authorized the construction of a 24-unit apartment project. This project was considered phase one of a two phase development involving TR 53605 and CUP 01-156.

Lot Line Adjustment No. 101,896 was approved on July 30, 2001 to adjust the lot lines between the subject property and the adjacent property on the south. A correction deed was recorded on August 15, 2002.

The current R-3-21U-DP zoning on the subject property became effective on December 19, 1992, following the adoption of Ordinance Number 920128-Z. The Hacienda Heights Zoned District was created on May 9, 1974 following the adoption of Ordinance Number 10877.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Revised TR 53605 proposes grading amounts of 98 cubic yards of cut and 198 cubic yards of fill with an additional 100 cubic yards of imported fill. These grading amounts were not proposed when TR 53605 was approved by the Hearing Officer of Los Angeles County on December 19, 2006. No other change is proposed to project design and layout.

HACIENDA HEIGHTS COMMUNITY GENERAL PLAN

The subject property is currently depicted within the Urban 4 (U4 - Medium High Density - 12.1 to 22.0 dwelling units per gross acre) land use category of the Hacienda Heights Community General Plan ("Plan"). This category permits a maximum of 11 dwelling units on the 0.52 gross acre property. The applicant's proposal of six new detached condominiums, is consistent with the maximum dwelling units allowed under the Medium High Density land use category.

Additional applicable Plan policies and goals include:

Land use and urban development pattern

DRAFT

- Where moderate to high density multiple dwellings adjoin single family residences, the higher density dwellings shall be designed to minimize their impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods and adjacent dwellings. Setbacks which are adequate to preserve the privacy of adjacent residences and yards shall be maintained. Nuisances such as trash areas shall be located away from residential structures and driveways should be located away from residential structures and driveways should be located to minimize impacts on local street traffic. Conditional Use Permits will be required on such projects to ensure that these concerns are addressed.

Housing and Community Development

- Encourage the provision of approximately 450 units for families and/or individuals of low and moderate income.
- Distribute low and moderate income units equitably throughout the community.

The following goals of the Land Use Element apply to the proposed subdivision:

- Coordination with Public Services: Expand park services and develop a system of equestrian trails.
- Quality Neighborhoods: Preserve the community as a predominately single family bedroom area.
- Coordination with Transportation: To improve traffic circulation.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

On October 18, 2001, the staff of the Department of Regional Planning completed its review of the Environmental Questionnaire and other data regarding the proposed development. A Negative Declaration has been recommended as the appropriate environmental document for this project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the Los Angeles County Environmental Guidelines. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental factor, and as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

An addendum to the Negative Declaration which describes the addition of project grading in the amounts of 98 cubic yards of cut and 198 cubic yards of fill with an additional 100 cubic yards of imported fill
was prepared on July 28, 2009 for this project.

COUNTY DEPARTMENT AND AGENCY COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Los Angeles County Subdivision Committee ("Subdivision Committee") consists of the Departments of Regional Planning, Public Works, Fire, Parks and Recreation, and Public Health. The Subdivision Committee has reviewed the revised vesting tentative tract map dated May 26, 2009, and recommends the attached conditions.

LEGAL NOTIFICATION/COMMUNITY OUTREACH

On December 2, 2009, approximately 71 notices of public hearing were mailed to property owners within a 500-foot radius of the subject property. The public hearing notice was published in The San Gabriel Valley Tribune and La Opinion on December 5, 2009. Project materials, including draft factual, staff report, draft findings and conditions of approval, tentative tract and exhibit "A" maps were sent to the La Puente Library on December 3, 2009. A public hearing notice was posted on the subject

property fronting Kinbrae Avenue and Clark Avenue on December 5, 2009. Public hearing materials were also posted on the Department of Regional Planning's website.

CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED BEFORE PUBLIC HEARING

No correspondence has been received at the time of writing.

STAFF EVALUATION

As currently revised, the proposed grading will not affect the approved six-unit condominium project's consistency with the Plan, and will allow for the project to move forward with approval of the Revised Map and Revised Exhibit "A" grading consistency plan.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The following recommendation is subject to change based on oral testimony or documentary evidence submitted during the public hearing process.

If the Hearing Officer feels that the revised vesting tentative tract map request is consistent and meets the requirements of the Plan, staff recommends that the Hearing Officer close the public hearing, and adopt the Addendum to the Negative Declaration. Staff also recommends that the Hearing Officer approve Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605.

Attachments:
Draft Findings and Conditions
Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 53605 and Exhibit Map

SMT:REC
12/3/09

DRAFT

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
REVISED VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 53605 **Map Date: 5-26-09**
Exhibit Map Date: 5-26-09

DRAFT CONDITIONS:

1. Conform to the requirements of Title 21 of the Los Angeles County Code ("County Code") (Subdivision Ordinance). Also, conform to the requirements of associated Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-157 and Parking Permit Case No. 200600018.

2. Except as otherwise specified by Conditional Use Permit No. 01-157, conform to the applicable requirements of the R-3-21U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence - 5,000 Square Feet Minimum Required Lot Area - 21 Dwelling Units per Net Acre - Development Program) zone.

3. The subdivider or successor in interest shall evidence that the conditions of the associated Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-157 and Parking Permit Case No. 200600018 have been recorded.

4. No grading permit shall be issued prior the recordation of a final map, unless the Director of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Director of Planning") determines that the proposed grading is consistent with the proposed grading amounts as depicted on the Revised Vesting Tentative Tract Map, dated May 26, 2009.

5. Prior to the issuance of any grading and/or building permit, three copies of a landscape plan which may be incorporated into a revised site plan, shall be submitted and approved by the Director of Planning as required by Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-157.

6. In accordance with Section 21.32.195 of the Los Angeles County Code, the subdivider or successor in interest shall plant or cause to be planted one tree of a non-invasive species within the front yard of each condominium unit; this project contains six condominium units. The location and the species of said trees shall be incorporated into a site plan or landscape plan. Prior to final map approval, the site/landscaping plan shall be approved by the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning ("Regional Planning"), and a bond shall be posted with the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works or other verification shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Regional Planning to ensure the planting of the required tree.

7. 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, and employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this tract map approval, or related discretionary approvals, whether legislative or quasi-judicial, which action is brought within the applicable time period of Government Code

Section 65499.37 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.

8. In the event that any claim, action, or proceeding as described above is filed against the County, the subdivider shall within 10 days of the filing pay Regional Planning an initial deposit of $5,000.00 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 subdivider, or subdivider's counsel. The subdivider 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 reach 80 percent of the amount on deposit, the subdivider shall deposit additional funds 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 for collection and duplication of records and other related documents will be paid by subdivider according to Section 2.170.010 of the County Code.

Except as modified herein above, this approval is subject to all those conditions set forth in Conditional Use Permit Case No. 01-157, Parking Permit Case No. 200600018, and the attached reports recommended by the Subdivision Committee, which consists of the Los Angeles County Departments of Public Works, Fire Department, Parks and Recreation, and Public Health, as well as Regional Planning.

DRAFT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION – SUBDIVISION
TRACT NO. 53605 (Rev'd)

REVISED MAP DATED 05-26-2009
EXHIBIT MAP DATED 05-26-2009

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.

HW

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. Prior to final approval of the tract 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.

8. Place standard condominium notes on the final map to the satisfaction of Public Works.

9. Quitclaim or relocate easements running through proposed structures.

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. 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.

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. The lot line adjustments must be recorded prior to or concurrently with the recordation of Tract 53605.

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 Phone (626) 458-4915 Date 06-10-2009

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
WWW.LADPW.ORG

TRACT MAP NO: 053605

REVISED TENTATIVE MAP DATE: 05/26/09
EXHIBIT MAP: 05/26/09

DRAINAGE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL, PHONE: (626) 458-4921

Approval of this map pertaining to drainage is recommended.

Prior to Improvement Plans Approval:

1. Comply with the requirements of the revised Drainage Concept / Hydrology Study / Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan / LID Plan which was conceptually approved on 08/06/09 to the satisfaction of Public Works.

Name _____ Date 08/06/2009 Phone (626) 458-4921
/CHRISTOPHER SHEPPARD

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION – GRADING
TRACT MAP NO. 53605 Rev.

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 05-26-2009
EXHIBIT MAP DATED 05-26-2009

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) as applicable plan by the Storm Drain and Hydrology Section of Land Development Division.

   b. The grading plan by the Geotechnical & Materials Engineering Division (GMED).

   c. Permits and/or letters of non-jurisdiction from all State and Federal Agencies, as applicable. These agencies may include, but may not be limited to the State of California Regional Water Quality Control Board, State of California Department of Fish and Game, State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR), and the Army Corps of Engineers.

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.

MD & AP

Name David Esfandi Date 06/10/09 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
1 Soils Engineer
1 GMED File
1 Subdivision

TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 53605
SUBDIVIDER Day One Development Corp.
ENGINEER Tritech Associates, Inc.
GEOLOGIST ---
SOILS ENGINEER Duco Engineering, Inc.

TENTATIVE MAP DATED 5/26/09 (Revision & Exhibit)
LOCATION Hacienda Heights
GRADING BY SUBDIVIDER [Y] (Y or N)
REPORT DATE ---
REPORT DATE 8/29/07

Other reports reviewed for the subdivision: Soils & Geology 5/13/02, 12/4/01, 11/4/92, 9/25/92

TENTATIVE MAP FEASIBILITY IS RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL FROM A GEOLOGIC STANDPOINT

THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE FULFILLED:

1. The final map must be approved by the Geotechnical and Materials Engineering Division (GMED) to assure that all geotechnical requirements have been properly depicted. For Final Map clearance guidelines refer to GS051.0 in the Manual for Preparation of Geotechnical Reports (http://dpw.lacounty.gov/gmed/Manual.pdf).

2. A grading plan must be geotechnically approved by the GMED prior to Final Map approval. The grading depicted on the plan must agree with the grading depicted on the tentative tract or parcel map and the conditions approved by the Planning Commission. If the subdivision is to be recorded prior to the completion and acceptance of grading, corrective geologic bonds may be required.

3. Prior to grading plan approval a detailed engineering geology and soils engineering report must be submitted that addresses the proposed grading. All recommendations of the geotechnical consultants must be incorporated into the plan (Refer to the Manual for Preparation of Geotechnical Reports at http://dpw.lacounty.gov/gmed/Manual.pdf).

4. All geologic hazards associated with this proposed development must be eliminated. Alternatively, the geologic hazards may be designated as restricted use areas (RUA), and their boundaries delineated on the Final Map. These RUAs must be approved by the GMED, and the subdivider must dedicate to the County the right to prohibit the erection of buildings or other structures within the restricted use areas (refer to GS063.0 in the manual for preparation of Geotechnical Reports).

5. The Soils Engineering review dated 6/2/09 is attached.

Reviewed by _____ Date 6/4/09
Geir Mathisen

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

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

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

Tentative Tract Map 53605
Location Kinbrae Avenue, Hacienda Heights
Developer/Owner Day One Development Corp.
Engineer/Architect Tritech Associates, Inc.
Soils Engineer Duco Engineering, Inc. (07-073)
Geologist -----

Review of:

Tentative Tract Map and Exhibit Dated by Regional Planning 5/26/09 (rev.)
Previous Review Sheet Dated 5/7/09

ACTION:

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

REMARKS:

At the grading plan stage, Submit two sets of grading plans to the Soils Section for verification of compliance with County codes and policies.

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
JEREMY WAN
NO. C67563
EXP. 6/30/09
CIVIL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Prepared by _____ Date 6/2/09

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.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION – ROAD
TRACT NO. 53605 (Rev.)

REVISED MAP DATED 05-26-2009
EXHIBIT MAP DATED 05-26-2009

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 32 feet from centerline on Clark Avenue. Two feet of additional right of way beyond the existing right of way line is required along the property frontage.

2. Provide property line return radius of 13 feet or to the satisfaction of Public Works at the intersection of Clark Avenue and Kinbrae Avenue.

3. Dedicate vehicular access rights on Clark Avenue, unless the Department of Regional Planning requires the construction of a wall. In such cases, complete access rights shall be dedicated.

4. Close any unused driveway with standard curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the property frontage on Clark Avenue and Kinbrae Avenue.

5. Repair any displaced, broken, or damaged curb, gutter, sidewalk, and pavement along the property frontage on Clark Avenue and Kinbrae Avenue.

6. Construct parkway improvements (sidewalk, driveways, landings, etc.) that either serve or form a part of a Pedestrian Access Route to meet current ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) requirements to the satisfaction of Public Works.

7. Construct additional sidewalk pop-out along the property frontage on Clark Avenue in the vicinity of any above ground utilities to meet current ADA requirements to the satisfaction of Public Works.

8. If needed, reconstruct the existing curb ramp at the corner of Clark Avenue/ Kinbrae Avenue abutting this property to meet current ADA standards to the satisfaction of Public Works.

9. Construct full width sidewalk at all returns.

10. 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.

11. Plant street trees on Clark Avenue and Kinbrae Avenue. Existing trees in dedicated or to be dedicated right of way shall be removed if not acceptable as street trees.

12. Comply with the following street lighting requirements:

    a. Provide street lights on concrete poles with underground wiring along the property frontage on Clark Avenue and Kinbrae Avenue to the satisfaction of Public Works. Submit street lighting plans as soon 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 of billing, all street lights in the development, or the current phase of the development, must be constructed according to 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.

13. Prior to final map 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 Public Works.

14. Provide a minimum spacing distance of 22 feet between the top of side slopes of adjacent driveways.

15. Provide a maximum width of 20 feet on the driveway apron including the common driveway.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION – SEWER
TRACT NO. 53605 (Rev'd)

REVISED MAP DATED 05-26-2009
EXHIBIT MAP DATED 05-26-2009

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 proposed sewer main line along Kinbrae Avenue shall be aligned along the east side of the road five feet from the centerline to the satisfaction of Public Works.

3. A sewer area study for the proposed subdivision (PC 11919AS, dated 06-28-2006) was reviewed and approved. No additional mitigation measures are required. The approved sewer area study shall remain valid for two years after initial approval of the tentative map. After this period of time, an update of the area study shall be submitted by the applicant if determined to be warranted by Public Works.

4. 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.

5. Easements are required, subject to review by Public Works to determine the final locations and requirements.

HCW

Prepared by Tony Khalkhali Phone (626) 458-4921 Date 06-04-2009

tr53605s-rev'd map-rev1(05-26-09).doc

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
LAND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION - WATER
TRACT NO. 53605 (Rev'd)

REVISED MAP DATED 05-26-2009
EXHIBIT MAP DATED 05-26-2009

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. If needed, construct off-site water main line to serve the proposed development to the satisfaction of Public Works.

4. Submit landscape and irrigation plans for each multi-family 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 Phone (626) 458-4921 Date 06-05-2009

tr53605w-rev'd map-rev1(05-26-09).doc

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT

5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR SUBDIVISION - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision: TR 53605 Map Date May 26, 2009 - Ex A

C.U.P. _____ Vicinity Baldwin

☐ **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: **Building separations have been approved at 8'.**

By Inspector: *Juan C. Padilla* Date June 16, 2009

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
FIRE DEPARTMENT

5823 Rickenbacker Road
Commerce, California 90040

WATER SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS - UNINCORPORATED

Subdivision No. TR 53605 Tentative Map Date May 26, 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 ____ gallons per minute at 20 psi. Each private on-site hydrant must be capable of flowing ____ 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). Upgrade / Verify existing ____ public fire hydrant(s).

Install ____ 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: ____

☐ All required fire hydrants shall be installed, tested and accepted or bonded for prior to Final Map approval. 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: **Per San Gabriel Valley Water Company fire flow test, existing 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 June 16, 2009

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

PARK OBLIGATION REPORT

Tentative Map # **53605**	DRP Map Date: **05/26/2009**	SCM Date: **06/11/2009**	Report Date: **06/08/2009**
Park Planning Area # **9**	**HACIENDA HEIGHTS**		Map Type: **REVISED**

Total Units **6** = Proposed Units **6** + Exempt Units **0**

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:	**$13,372**

Conditions of the map approval:

The park obligation for this development will be met by:

The payment of $13,372 in-lieu fees.

Trails:

No trails.

*****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 4th
June 08, 2009 13:23:50
QMB02F.FRX

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

PARK OBLIGATION WORKSHEET

Tentative Map # **53605**	DRP Map Date: **05/26/2009**	SMC Date: **06/11/2009**	Report Date: **06/08/2009**
Park Planning Area # **9**	**HACIENDA HEIGHTS**		Map Type: **REVISED**

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

(P)eople 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 **6** = Proposed Units **6** + Exempt Units **0**

	People*	Goal 3.0 Acres / 1000 People	Number of Units	Acre Obligation
Detached S.F. Units	**3.50**	**0.0030**	**6**	**0.06**
M.F. < 5 Units	2.70	0.0030	0	0.00
M.F. >= 5 Units	2.30	0.0030	0	0.00
Mobile Units	2.78	0.0030	0	0.00
Exempt Units			0	
			Total Acre Obligation =	**0.06**

Park Planning Area = **9 HACIENDA HEIGHTS**

Goal	Acre Obligation	RLV / Acre	In-Lieu Base Fee
@(0.0030)	0.06	$222,869	**$13,372**

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

Acre Obligation	Public Land Crdt.	Priv. Land Crdt.	Net Obligation	RLV / Acre	**In-Lieu Fee Due**
0.06	0.00	0.00	0.06	$222,869	**$13,372**

Supv D 4th
June 08, 2009 13:24:11
QMB01F.FRX

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
Public Health

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
5050 Commerce Drive
Baldwin Park, California 91706
TEL (626) 430-5280 • FAX (626) 960-2740

www.publichealth.lacounty.gov

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

June 9, 2009

RFS No. 09-0014141

Tract Map No. 53605

Vicinity: Hacienda Heights

Vesting Tentative Tract Map Date: May 26, 2009 (1st Revision to Amendment)

The Los Angeles County Department of Health Services' conditions of approval for **Vesting Tentative Tract Map 53605** are unchanged by the submission of the revised map. The following conditions still apply and are in force:

1. Potable water will be supplied through the **San Gabriel Valley Water Company**, a public water system.

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.

Respectfully,

KHabaradas

Ken Habaradas, REHS
Bureau of Environmental Protection

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

ADDENDUM TO NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: *CUP 01-157 / TR53605*

1. DESCRIPTION:
The current application for a discretionary approval of a revised map proposes grading to include 98 cubic yards of cut, 198 cubic yards of fill, and 100 cubic yards of import. The project was previously approved for six detached condominium units with a proposed grading of 10 cubic yards that was to be balanced onsite. The increased grading proposed in the current request is considered minor and is not anticipated to result in any new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects. Therefore, additional environmental analysis associated with the minor increase in grading is not required as impacts have been analyzed in the previous environmental document.

2. LOCATION:

Corner of Kinbrae Avenue and E. Clark Avenue, Hacienda Heights

3. PROPONENT:

Day One Development Corp.
P.O. Box 1684
Monrovia, CA 91017

4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT EFFECT:

BASED ON THE ATTACHED 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 ADDENDUM TO NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: *Christina D. Tran*

DATE: *October 28, 2009*

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: *01-157*
CASES: *TR53605*
CUP

*** * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * ***

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: *July 26, 2001* Staff Member: *Christina D. Tran*
Thomas Guide: *638 A-7* USGS Quad: *Baldwin Park*
Location: *Corner of Kinbrae Avenue and E. Clark Avenue; Hacienda Heights*

Description of Project: *As a Phase II, this is an application for a Tentative Tract Map to construct six detached two-story condominiums with a two-car garage for each unit. A CUP is also requested in order to have the proposed development in a DP zone. Each condominium will have an area of 1,599 square feet in addition to a 386 square feet garage. For Phase I, there is a pending application under CUP 01-156 to construct a 24 unit apartment building.*

Gross Acres: *Approximately 16,000 square feet*
Environmental Setting: *Project site is a flat lot located in an urbanized area with no significant vegetation or animal habitat. Currently, there are numerous equipments, materials, and supplies stored at the project site. Surrounding uses consist of single family residences, commercial/manufacturing establishments, a school, a church, a vacant lot, and a railroad track.*

Zoning: *R-3-21U-DP (Limited Multiple Residence, 21U, Development Program)*
General Plan: *Low Density Residential*
Community/Area wide Plan: *Commercial (Hacienda Heights Community General Plan)*

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
TR50217	*1 MF/30 NC lot on 1.52 acre (12-16-92 approved)*
ZC91220	*C1 to R3 on 1.52 acre (11-19-92 adopted)*
CP01156	*24 unit apartment building (pending)*

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 Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☒ *City of Industry*
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Regional Significance

- ☒ None
- ☐ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ DPW: *Geology & Soil, Traffic & Lighting*
- ☒ Health Department: *Environmental Hygiene*
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

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	
CATEGORY	**FACTOR**	Pg				Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Flood	6	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Fire	7	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Noise	8	☒	☐	☐	
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Air Quality	10	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Biota	11	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Cultural Resources	12	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mineral Resources	13	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	☒	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	☒	☐	☐	
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Education	18	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Utilities	20	☒	☐	☐	
OTHER	1. General	21	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Environmental Safety	22	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Land Use	23	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mandatory Findings	25	☒	☐	☐	

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: *Conservation/Maintenance*
2. ☒ Yes ☐ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?
3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

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, in as much 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: Christina Cran Date: 10-18-01

Approved by: Date: 10-18-01

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

*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.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?
				Liquefaction
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
d.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?
				Liquefaction
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

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

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

DPW concluded that project will not have significant impacts in their letter dated 9/19/01. Applicant shall comply with all conditions and recommendations of the DPW's letter dated 9/19/01.

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.	☐	☒	☐	Is the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☐ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

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 - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in a high fire hazard area (Fire Zone 4)?
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade? *Access may be inadequate*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	☐	☐	☒	Other factors? *Industrialized area*

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☐ Fire Prevention Guide No.46

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Applicant shall comply with county codes

CONCLUSION

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

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

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? *Railroad track*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? *School*
c.	☐	☒	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

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

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Health Department concluded that the project will not have significant impacts in their letter dated 10/6/01.

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.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
	☐	☐	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	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?
d.	☐	☒	☐	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?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
☐ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
☐ NPDES Permit CAS614001 Compliance (DPW)

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ 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, **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.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use?
c.	☐	☒	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely 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.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located within Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site?
d.	☐	☒	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

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

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.	☐	☒	☐	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) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase 1 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.	☐	☒	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	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.	☐	☐	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	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?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	☐	☐	☐	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 **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.	☐	☒	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave 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.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (mid-block or intersections)? *30 dwelling units for Phase I and II*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? *Access may be inadequate*
e.	☐	☒	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☒ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

DPW concluded that the proposed project will not have significant impacts in their letter dated 9/24/01.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **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 MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

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.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
e.	☐	☐	☐	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 Fee

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.	☐	☒	☐	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?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
e.	☐	☒	☐	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)?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

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

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ 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.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

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

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ 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.	☐	☒	☐	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on a site that 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.	☐	☒	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	☐	☐	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	☐	☒	☐	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:
	☐	☒	☐	Hillside Management Criteria?
	☐	☒	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	☐	☐	☐	Other?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	☐	☐	☐	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 **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.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
b.	☐	☒	☐	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.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	☐	☐	☐	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 that 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