**INITIAL STUDY**

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: N/A  Staff Member: Julie Moore

Thomas Guide: N/A  USGS Quad: N/A

Location: Countywide

Description of Project: A proposed ordinance amending Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Los Angeles County Code pertaining to Density Bonuses consistent with the State Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915), which allows for increased residential densities for projects that guarantee that a portion of housing units will be affordable to households of low income, moderate income, senior citizens, or where a qualifying land donation or a childcare facility is also proposed in conjunction with qualified housing projects. The ordinance amendments would restructure the affordable housing provisions in the Zoning Ordinance for ease of use, delete obsolete provisions, amend existing references for internal consistency, and establish revised fees. (A copy of the detailed project description is attached).

Gross Area: Countywide

Environmental Setting: Countywide (urban, suburban, non-urban, rural)

Zoning: Applicability to all zones where residential uses are permitted

General Plan: Countywide

Community/Area Wide Plan: Countywide
Major projects in area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Description &amp; Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies
- [ ] None
- [x] Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - [x] Los Angeles Region
  - [x] Lahontan Region
- [x] Coastal Commission
- [ ] Army Corps of Engineers
- [ ] ________________

Trustee Agencies
- [x] None
- [ ] State Fish and Game
- [ ] State Parks
- [ ] ________________
- [ ] ________________

Special Reviewing Agencies
- [ ] None
- [x] Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- [ ] National Parks
- [ ] National Forest
- [x] Edwards Air Force Base
- [ ] Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mtns.
- [x] SCAG
- [ ] ________________

Regional Significance
- [ ] None
- [x] SCAG Criteria
- [ ] Air Quality
- [ ] Water Resources
- [ ] Santa Monica Mtns Area
- [ ] ________________

County Reviewing Agencies
- [ ] Subdivision Committee
- [x] DPW: _____
- [x] Health Services: _____
- [x] Fire Department
- [x] Sanitation Districts
- [ ] Public Library
- [x] Sheriff
## IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>Pg</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Potential Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAZARDS</td>
<td>1. Geotechnical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Flood</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Fire</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Noise</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOURCES</td>
<td>1. Water Quality</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Air Quality</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Biota</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Cultural Resources</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Mineral Resources</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Agriculture Resources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Visual Qualities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICES</td>
<td>1. Traffic/Access</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Sewage Disposal</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Fire/Sheriff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Utilities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>1. General</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Environmental Safety</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Land Use</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandatory Findings</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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: *The ordinance amendments apply Countywide.*

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**, 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: Julie Moore Date: May 10, 2005

Approved by: Ronald D. Hoffman Date: May 10, 2005

☑ 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).

☐ 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

a. Yes ☒ No ☐ Maybe ☐ Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone?
   
   All of the unincorporated area lies within a general region of known fault zones and seismic activity (per California Seismic Hazards maps, California Special Study Zones maps, and the Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element Plate 1).

b. Yes ☐ No ☒ Maybe ☐ Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
   
   There are some unincorporated areas that contain landslides and are not suitable for development (per Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element Plate 5).

c. Yes ☒ No ☐ Maybe ☐ Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
   
   There are some unincorporated areas that have high slope instability and are not suitable for development.

d. Yes ☒ No ☐ Maybe ☐ Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction?
   
   There are some unincorporated areas that contain high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction, and may not be suitable for development (per Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element Plates 3 and 4).

e. Yes ☒ No ☐ Maybe ☐ Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
   
   The project is an ordinance amendment which, if adopted, relates to the development of qualified housing projects, and may be located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard.

f. Yes ☒ No ☐ Maybe ☐ Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%?
   
   The project is an ordinance amendment which, if adopted, relates to development of residential or mixed-use projects. These development projects may involve grading over slopes of more than 25%.

g. Yes ☒ No ☐ Maybe ☐ 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?
   
   There are some unincorporated areas that contain expansive soil.

h. Yes ☒ No ☐ Maybe ☐ Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.
The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. No geology or soils impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed amendments. Subsequent projects proposed as a result of this ordinance will be subject to project-specific environmental review, as appropriate, to determine if they pose any potential impacts to the environment. The density bonus, incentive or concession, and/or requests for the waiver or modification of development standards of any project facilitated by this ordinance will be denied if, based on substantial evidence, it will have a specific adverse impact, such as geotechnical hazards, upon public health and safety or the physical environment.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are major drainage courses located within the unincorporated area (per USGS maps).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some unincorporated areas that contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone (per Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element Plate 6).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are some unincorporated areas subject to high mudflow conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance, as it relates to the County's density bonus regulations. Subsequent development projects facilitated by the ordinance may expose more residents to potential flood related hazards in certain areas. These projects will be subject to the appropriate environmental review on a project-by-project basis, and their associated impacts analyzed at that time.

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)?</td>
<td>There are some unincorporated areas that are within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4) (per Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element Plate 7) and residential developments that may be facilitated by adoption of the ordinance amendments have the potential to increase public exposure to fire safety hazards within these areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?</td>
<td>There are unincorporated areas that have inadequate water and pressure to meet fire hazard conditions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other factors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834  ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947  ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8
☐ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES  /  ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design  ☐ Compatible Use

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. Subsequent projects will be subject to environmental review, as appropriate, to determine if they would cause any potential impacts to the environment or public safety.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)?  
  New residential development facilitated by the adoption of the ordinance amendments is not expected to generate any noise levels that exceed the standards in the County Noise Ordinance. However, it is possible that the residents of the homes could be exposed to excessive noise levels if the homes are built near existing noise sources such as highways, railroads, raceways, airports, or industrial operations. |
| b.  |    |       |
| Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? There are sensitive uses throughout the unincorporated county area. |
| 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? Although the ordinance will not result in the direct increase in ambient noise levels, projects facilitated by the ordinance may increase ambient noise levels due to higher density development, such as traffic, human voices, landscape maintenance equipment, and similar noise generators. |
| 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? Construction noise from projects facilitated by the ordinance. |
| e.  |    |       |
| 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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. Projects facilitated by the ordinance will increase land use density and therefore increase project noise level. County Code requirements include noise-sensitive construction methods and other sound attenuation measures, such as the installation of sound walls to protect residents and surrounding uses from these noise impacts. In addition, future projects will be subject to project-specific noise and vibration evaluations during the appropriate environmental review process.

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

a. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells?
   
   There are unincorporated areas that are known to have water quality problems.

b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
   
   Public sewers are not available in all areas of Los Angeles County.

   ☐ ☐ ☒ 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?
   
   Some unincorporated areas have septic system limitations.

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?
   
   Projects facilitated by the ordinance may be subject to NPDES requirements.

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?
   
   Projects facilitated by the ordinance may be subject to NPDES requirements.

e. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? 

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit ☒ Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5

☒ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

MTIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County’s Density Bonus regulations. The proposed ordinance amendments do not constitute proposed construction of a site specific land use project. Subsequent projects will be subject to environmental review.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. The proposed amendments will not impact any Air Quality issues. Subsequent projects will be subject to environmental review to determine if they would cause any potential impacts.

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. ☐ ☐ ☒ 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?
   *Many areas within unincorporated Los Angeles County are relatively natural and undisturbed (per Los Angeles County SEA and ESHA maps.)*

b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
   *New residential development facilitated by the ordinance within areas of very high fire hazard severity will require implementation of a fuel modification plan.*

c. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site?
   *New residential development facilitated by the ordinance may be located near a drainage course, particularly as water wells may be located near a source of high ground water (per USGS maps.)*

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.)?
   *New residential development facilitated by the ordinance may be located in unincorporated areas where riparian or other sensitive habitat is known to exist.*

e. ☐ ☐ ☒ Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
   *There are oaks and other unique native trees within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.*

f. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?
   *There are some unincorporated areas that contain sensitive species.*

g. ☐ ☐ ☒ Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?
   *There are some unincorporated areas that contain valuable wildlife corridors.*

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County’s Density Bonus regulations. Future projects may have to perform evaluations for the presence of specific biological resources, conduct tree surveys, or other applicable studies or permits as appropriate to the project site(s).

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

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) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?

There are areas that contain known archaeological resources or that contain features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees), which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity within unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.

b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?

There are areas that contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources.

c. ☐ ☐ ☒ Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?

There are areas that 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 I Archaeology Report

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the the County's Density Bonus regulations. As noted in the State Law, the County is not required to waive or reduce development standards that would have an adverse impact on public health, safety, the physical environment, or any real property that is listed in the California Register of Historical Resources. As such, subsequent projects would be reviewed to determine if they would cause any impacts.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other factors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Lot Size
- Project Design

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. The proposed amendments are not anticipated to have any effect on mineral resources. Subsequent projects will be subject to environmental review as appropriate to determine if they pose any potential impacts to the environment.

### 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
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?

There is prime farmland in the unincorporated area (Los Angeles County Important Farmland map).

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 which, 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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. The proposed amendments will not, in and of themselves, create an impact to agricultural resources. Subsequent projects facilitated by the ordinance will be subject to environmental review as appropriate to determine if they pose any potential impacts to the environment.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The unincorporated County area contains many significant viewshed and scenic resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some areas are visible from regional riding or hiking trails.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are undeveloped or undisturbed areas throughout the County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed ordinance regulates density bonuses for qualified projects. As a result, the land use density of a qualified project may increase and/or development standards, including setbacks and height restrictions, may be modified, where surrounding land uses or existing community were not developed under the same standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed ordinance regulates density bonuses for qualified projects. As a result, the land use density of a qualified project may increase and/or development standards, including setbacks and height restrictions, may be modified. Higher density and modification of development standards may result in higher or bulkier structures relative to surrounding land uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration):</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- [ ] Lot Size
- [ ] Project Design
- [ ] Visual Report
- [ ] Compatible Use

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. The proposed amendments will not, in and of themselves, create an impact to visual resources. Subsequent projects will be subject to environmental review as appropriate to determine if they pose any potential impacts to the environment.

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)?

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?

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 programs 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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. While the proposed amendments will create the potential for increased traffic associated with a given density bonus, the impact associated with the given bonus will be addressed at the individual project level and will be required to go through environmental review, as appropriate. Standard conditions of approval, applicable to all development projects, include the payment of traffic mitigation fees, which serve to mitigate smaller projects and those determined to have only a generalized, incremental impact on the traffic system.

Section 22.52.1840 1(c) of the Zoning Code provides parking standards for projects qualified under the proposed ordinance. Standard conditions of approval imposed on residential development projects include restrictions on the number of cars that can be accommodated on-site, and may include restrictions to prevent on-street parking within the surrounding neighborhood where a concern exists. Special parking needs that may apply in specific circumstances are addressed on a case-by-case basis. With the imposition of existing Code requirements, impacts related to the provision of parking are not expected to be significant.
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

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

_The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County’s Density Bonus regulations. The proposed amendments may create potential increased service system usage, and the impact significant on those systems depends on existing demand and design capacity of such system. Subsequent projects, however, will be required to go through the appropriate environmental review. Additional authorization in district annexation or system improvement may be required._

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are known capacity problems within some school districts in the unincorporated area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are known capacity problems within some individual schools in the unincorporated area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Could the project create student transportation problems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development of new housing projects could create short-term student transportation problems for school districts in the unincorporated area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The development of new housing projects could create library impacts due to increased population and demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Other factors?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. While the proposed amendments may create additional demand on existing schools and libraries, all projects facilitated by the ordinance will be subject to the same school and library impacts fees, as required by Section 65995 of the Government Code and the applicable County ordinance.

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

a. ☒ ☐ ☐ Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?

There are areas in the County that do not receive a desirable level of fire or sheriff service coverage.

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

The Sheriff's Department indicates that there is no established financial mechanism to sufficiently support a desirable level of services in the County's unincorporated area.

c. ☐ ☐ ☐ Other factors? __________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☑ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☑ Fire Mitigation Fees

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. Subsequent projects facilitated by the proposed ordinance, however, will be required to go through the appropriate environmental review.

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?

_There are unincorporated areas known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have inadequate groundwater supply._

b. ☐ ☐ ☒ Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?

_There are unincorporated areas known to have an inadequate water supply and/or water 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)?

_There is an overall shortage in the County's landfill facilities._

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 CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

_The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. While the proposed amendments may create potential increased service system usage, it is not expected that the increase would be significant. Typically, the County could expect that density bonus projects would be spread throughout the county rather than concentrated in one area, and that the relative increases would be small in relation to the systems. Subsequent projects, however, will be required to go through the appropriate environmental review to evaluate impacts._

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
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OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

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?

The proposed ordinance amendments relating to density bonuses would allow additional new dwelling units beyond what is currently allowed on a site, so long as the project involves a minimum of five units or more. Individually and cumulatively, the project could result in changes in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community. However, the County could typically expect that density bonus projects would be spread throughout the unincorporated area rather than concentrated in one area, and that the relative change in patterns, scale, or character, would be minimal in relation to the County as a whole.

c. ☐ ☒ ☐ Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?

d. ☐ ☐ ☐ 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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. Future density bonus projects facilitated by this ordinance will be subject to the appropriate environmental review.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTING/IMPACTS</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are sites with soil toxicity problems and known groundwater contamination sources throughout the County. Increased land use density may expose more residents to such sources if a project is located close to these sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are known &quot;brownfield&quot; sites within the unincorporated area and future housing projects may be built on these sites once site clean-up and the necessary site remediation are completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other factors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

- Toxic Clean up Plan
The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. Future projects facilitated by the ordinance will be subject to the appropriate environmental review on a project-by-project basis to evaluate site-specific contamination issues, if any.

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

- [ ] Potentially significant
- [ ] Less than significant with project mitigation
- [x] 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?

*The density bonus, if granted, may result in additional units exceeding what is permitted under the County's General Plan.*

b. ☐ ☒ ☐ Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?

*The density bonus will be allowed under the ordinance, if adopted.*

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

_The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. The proposed amendments are intended to facilitate housing development consistent with State Density Bonus Law._

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 a 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?

   New residential development projects could require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents, and additional density granted under the ordinance will further increase the demand.

f. ☐ ☒ ☐ Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

g. ☐ ☒ ☐ Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the County's Density Bonus regulations. The proposed amendments are intended to facilitate affordable housing development consistent with State Density Bonus Law. The proposed amendments may create the potential demand for additional employment opportunities and recreational facilities, it is not expected that the increase will be significant. Future residential projects will be required to go through the appropriate environmental review to evaluate any impacts to population, housing, employment, and recreational facilities.

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
DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project RADV#200500007 consists of the adoption of an Ordinance amending Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code (the Zoning Ordinance) pertaining to Density Bonuses. The amendments to the Zoning Ordinance are proposed to maintain compliance with recent changes to State Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915). Adoption of the subject Ordinance will replace, delete, and amend sections of the County Code. The Zoning Ordinance amendments are considered to be subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the analysis is contained herein.

It is important to note that, while the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments themselves will not result in a physical change to the environment, they would in some cases make the permitting process for conforming projects easier by removing or reducing certain regulatory barriers to specific types of housing production. However, in most cases, CEQA review of individual proposals on a project-by-project basis will continue to be necessary.

The County of Los Angeles Department of Regional Planning has drafted proposed changes to the existing Zoning Ordinance that supports the implementation of programs and policies contained in the adopted General Plan Housing Element. The Zoning Ordinance amendments will bring the County’s density bonus provisions into conformance with State Law. Adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendments will change certain development standards and review procedures within the unincorporated areas.

Compilation and Revision of Density Bonus Provisions: Revisions to the Zoning Ordinance are necessary to comply with the recent changes to State Density Bonus Law (Government Code Section 65915). In order to restructure the affordable housing provisions in the Zoning Ordinance for ease of use, the Zoning Ordinance Sections dealing with general regulations and standards for affordable housing density bonuses would be revised and integrated into a new Part 17 of Chapter 22.52. Similarly, the Zoning Ordinance Sections dealing with the permit and review procedures for affordable housing density bonuses would be revised and integrated into a new Part 18 of Chapter 22.56. Obsolete provisions will also be deleted.

Other Ordinance Edits and Updates: Minor edits were completed to provide consistency between Ordinance Sections, to clarify the applicability of certain provisions, and to provide updated references. These edits do not involve a substantive change.

Due to the nature of the project – the adoption of amendments to the existing Zoning Ordinance to provide consistency with the General Plan Housing Element, where the specific sites of future development activities are not yet known - there is a lack of site-specific knowledge with which to conduct a site-specific environmental review. Therefore, this environmental review is conducted at a “plan” level of analysis, rather than the more detailed site-specific level. No actual site-specific development is proposed by the Zoning Ordinance amendments. Therefore, an analysis which includes more detailed, site-specific information about any potential development impacts is not feasible at this time and would occur when the appropriate agency prepares a future environmental document in connection with site-specific project activities, pursuant to CCR §15152 (c).

A more detailed project-level analysis pursuant to the CEQA will continue to be required for any project activity that has the potential to impact the physical environment. CEQA provides numerous exemptions for certain types of development activities which might be allowed by adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendments, including:
• Section 15279 of CCR provides a statutory exemption for the provision of some agricultural housing (See § 21080.10 of PRC).
• Section 15280 of CCR provides statutory exemptions for some smaller, low-income housing projects (See § 21080.14 of PRC).

Additionally, the following activities are identified as Categorically Exempt from further review under CEQA:

• Section 15332 of CCR (Class 32) provides an exemption for smaller infill residential or mixed-use development projects.

Due to the large number of CEQA exemptions available for affordable housing and the development of smaller housing projects, it is likely that some future development projects, which may be facilitated by adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendments, could be considered exempt from project-level environmental review under CEQA. It is important to note, however, that use of CEQA exemptions is not authorized in cases where the individual circumstances of a particular development project have the reasonably foreseeable potential for negative environmental impacts (§ 15300.2), and any such future development projects will continue to require project-level environmental review.

According to CEQA requirements, the assessment of potential impacts resulting from a project (in this case, adoption of the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments) is limited to the difference between the expected situation with the project (adoption of the proposed amendments), and the existing environment (no change to the existing Zoning Ordinance). Consistency between the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance is required by State Law. Even without the adoption of the proposed amendments, the same unincorporated land area could reasonably be developed with housing consistent with the General Plan (Housing Element). Adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendments would not allow the development of housing that would not otherwise be allowed under the General Plan and Zoning pursuant to the provisions of State Law. It would, however, likely facilitate the provision of such housing as affordable, therefore increasing the number of affordable units available to County residents. The provision of affordable housing units within unincorporated urban areas results in more affordable housing units made available closer to jobs. This is considered to be a positive environmental impact, reducing driving time, reducing air pollutant emissions, promoting more compact development (reducing the need for greenfield development), among other benefits.

The adoption of the proposed Zoning Ordinance amendments would not, in and of itself, have an impact on the physical environment. It would not authorize the development of specific housing projects; all new projects will continue to be subject to individual project review and analysis as required by CEQA. The project’s potential for impacts of any type is limited to the extent to which they would facilitate the development of residential units that would not be developed without the adoption of the amendments.