DRAFT 3/21/07

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: ____

CASE: *RADVT200600009*

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

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: *N/A* Staff Member: Connie Chung

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

Location: *Countywide*

Description of Project: *A proposed ordinance amending Title 22 (Planning and Zoning) of the Los Angeles County Code pertaining to mixed-use projects. The ordinance amendments would modify certain commercial zones to allow mixed use projects (mixed residential and commercial developments and joint live and work units) through an administrative procedure, add development and performance standards for mixed use projects, prohibit or make certain commercial uses, otherwise allowed by-right, subject to permit in mixed use projects, allow certain less intensive commercial uses in joint live and work units, and restructure various sections of Title 22 for consistency and ease of use (a copy of the detailed project description and draft ordinance are attached).*

Gross Area: *Countywide*

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

Zoning: *Applicability to all commercially designated areas where multifamily residential uses are permitted (Zones C-H Commercial Highway, C-1 Restricted Business Zone, C-2 Neighborhood Business, C-3 Unlimited Commercial, C-M Commercial Manufacturing).*

General Plan: *Countywide*

Community/Area Wide Plan: *Countywide*

DRAFT 3/21/07

Major projects in area:

Project Number	Description & Status
N/A	

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
- ☒ *Caltrans*

Trustee Agencies

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

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☒ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mtns.
- ☒ *SCAG*
- ☒ *State of California Housing and Community Development Department*
- ☒ *State of California Office of Planning and Research*
- ☐ _____
- ☐ _____
- ☐ _____
- ☐ _____

Regional Significance

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

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ DPW: *Traffic and Lighting, Geotechnical and Materials Engineering, Grading and Drainage, Waterworks and Sewer Maintenance.*
- ☒ Health Services: _____
- ☒ *Fire Department*
- ☒ *Sanitation Districts*
- ☒ *Public Library*
- ☒ *Sheriff*
- ☒ *Parks and Recreation*

DRAFT 3/21/07

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX

CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg	Less than Significant Impact/No Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Flood	7	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Fire	9	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Noise	10	☒	☐	☐	
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	11	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Air Quality	13	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Biota	14	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Cultural Resources	16	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mineral Resources	17	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	18	☒	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	19	☒	☐	☐	
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	20	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Sewage Disposal	21	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Education	22	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Fire/Sheriff	23	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Utilities	24	☒	☐	☐	
OTHER	1. General	25	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Environmental Safety	26	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Land Use	28	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	29	☒	☐	☐	
	Mandatory Findings	30	☒	☐	☐	

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.

DRAFT 3/21/07

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: *Connie Chung, AICP, Acting Senior Planning Assistant* Date: *March 2007*

Approved by: *Julie Moore, AICP, Supervising Regional Planner* Date: *March 2007*

☐ 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

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	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 areas if Los Angeles County lies within a general region of known fault zones and seismic activity (per California Seismic Hazards maps, California Special Study Zones maps, Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element Plate 1).*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? *There are some unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County that contain landslides and are not suitable for development (per Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element Plate 5).*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? *There are some unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County that have high slope instability and are not suitable for development.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? *There are some unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County 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.	☐	☐	☒	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 mixed-use projects, which may be located in close proximity to significant geo hazards.*
f.	☐	☐	☒	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 the development of mixed use projects. These projects may involve grading over slopes of more than 25%.*
g.	☐	☐	☒	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 of Los Angeles County that contain expansive soil.*
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? _____

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

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

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

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

The project is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed-use projects. 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.

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 a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? *There are major drainage courses located within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County (per USGS maps).*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? *There are some unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County that contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone (per Los Angeles County General Plan Safety Element Plate 6).*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? *There are some unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County that are 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 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 mixed use projects. 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 appropriate environmental review on the 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

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)? *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 mixed use projects that may be facilitated by adoption of the ordinance amendments have the potential to increase public exposure to fire safety hazards within these areas.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
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? *There are unincorporated areas that have inadequate water and pressure to meet fire hazard conditions.*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site 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?

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 mixed use projects. 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

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? *New mixed use projects 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, employees and visitors of the mixed use projects could be exposed to excessive noise levels if the projects 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 areas of Los Angeles County.*
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 direct increase in ambient noise level, mixed use projects facilitated by the ordinance may increase ambient noise levels as a result of higher density housing in commercial areas, 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 mixed use 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 mixed use projects. Projects facilitated by the ordinance could potentially 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

	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? *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 in Los Angeles County 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? *Mixed use 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? *Mixed use 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)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed use projects. The proposed amendments do not constitute the proposed construction of a site-specific land use project. Subsequent projects will be subject to environmental review, as appropriate.

DRAFT 3/21/07

CONCLUSION

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

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

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	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?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? *Such sources exist throughout the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.*
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 an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors:

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

The project is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed use projects. The proposed amendments will not impact any Air Quality issues. Subsequent projects will be subject to environmental review, as appropriate.

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 mixed use projects facilitated by the ordinance within very high fire hazard severity zones will require the implementation of a fuel modification.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is a major drainage course located on the project site that is depicted on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line or that may contain a bed, channel, or bank of any perennial, intermittent or ephemeral river, stream or lake? *New mixed use projects 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 mixed use projects facilitated by the ordinance may be located in unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, where riparian or other sensitive habitats are 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 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 mixed-use projects. 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

	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) 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 archeaological sensitivity within the 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 mixed use projects. As such, subsequent projects would be reviewed, as appropriate, 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

	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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed use projects. 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

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?
				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 mixed use projects. The proposed amendments will not, in and of themselves, create an impact to agriculture 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

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? *Some unincorporated area of Los Angeles County contains many significant viewshed and scenic resources.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? *Some areas are visible from regional riding or hiking trail.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? *There are undeveloped or undisturbed area throughout the unincorporated areas of Los AngelesCounty.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? *The proposed ordinance includes new development standards for mixed use projects in regards to height and density for residential uses in areas where surrounding land uses or existing community were not developed under the same standards.*
e.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? *As a result, land use density of a qualified project may increase and/or development standards including setbacks and height restrictions modified. The proposed ordinance includes new development standards for mixed use projects in regards to height and density for residential uses. This may result in higher or massive structures relative to surrounding land uses.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration):

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed use projects. 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

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)? *The development of new mixed use projects, as may be facilitated by adoption of the ordinance amendments, could add incrementally to the overall increase in local traffic. Such impacts can only be addressed on a project-level review.*
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? *New construction of mixed use projects could result in parking shortages if parking needs are not adequately assessed and provided for in the project design.*
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 mixed use projects. While the proposed amendments will create the potential for increased traffic associated with encouraging mixed use projects, the impact associated with the projects will be addressed at the invidual project level and will be required to go through environmental review as appropriate. In addition, 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.

CONCLUSION

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

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

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed use projects. The proposed amendments may create potential increased service system usage and the impact significant on those systems depend on existing demand and design capacity of such system. Subsequent projects, however, will be required, as appropriate, to go through an 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

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level? *There are known capacity problems within some school districts in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site? *There are known capacity problems within some individual schools in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create student transportation problems? *The development of new mixed-use projects could create short-term student transportation problems for school districts in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? *The development of new mixed-use projects could create 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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed use projects. 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

	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? *There are areas in the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County that receive an undesirable level of Fire/Sheriff services.*
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 unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.*
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? _____

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ Fire Mitigation Fees

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed use projects. Subsequent projects facilitated by the proposed ordinance, however, will be required, as appropriate, to go through an 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 of Los Angeles County 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 of Los Angeles County 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 mixed use projects. While the proposed amendments may create potential increased service system usage, it is not expected that the increase would be significant. Subsequent projects will be required, as appropriate, to go through an 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

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? *The proposed ordinance amendments relating to mixed use projects would encourage additional new dwelling units in commercial zones, but most of the standards would generally conform to the development standards for the underlying zone. 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 mixed use 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 mixed use projects. Future projects facilitated by this ordinance will be subject to environmental review, as appropriate.

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 or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed? *There are sites with soil toxicity problems and known groundwater contamination sources throughout the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.*
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 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? *There are known "brownfield" sites within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, and future mixed use projects may be built on these sites once site clean-up and the necessary site remediation are completed.*
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

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed use projects. Future projects facilitated by the

ordinance will be subject to environmental review, as appropriate, 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 ☒ 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**

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed use projects. The proposed amendments are intended to facilitate the development of mixed use projects consistent with the General Plan and Housing Element.

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 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 mixed use projects could 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**

The proposal is to amend the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to mixed use projects. Although 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 mixed use projects will be required to go through the appropriate environmental review, as appropriate, 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 T2006-00009** consists of the adoption of an ordinance amending Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code (Planning and Zoning) pertaining to mixed use projects. The amendments to Title 22 modify certain commercial zones (C-H Commercial Highway, C-1 Restricted Business Zone, C-2 Neighborhood Business, C-3 Unlimited Commercial, C-M Commercial Manufacturing) to allow mixed use projects, including mixed-use (residential/commercial) developments and joint live and work units, through an administrative procedure; add development and performance standards for mixed-use projects; prohibit or make certain commercial uses, otherwise allowed by-right, subject to permit in mixed use projects; allow certain less intensive commercial uses in joint live and work units; and restructure various sections of Title 22 for consistency and ease of use.

Adoption of the proposed ordinance will amend, delete, and add sections to the County Code. 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 and Housing Element. Adoption of the Zoning Ordinance amendments will change certain development standards and review procedures within the unincorporated areas. 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 Title 22 amendments 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 mixed-use projects. However, in most cases, CEQA review of individual proposals on a project-by-project basis will continue to be necessary.

Development and performance standards for mixed-use projects:

In order to restructure the mixed use provisions in the Zoning Ordinance for ease of use, the Zoning Ordinance sections addressing general regulations and standards for mixed-use projects would be integrated into a new Part 18 (Mixed Use Developments) and a new Part 19 (Joint Live and Work Units) of Chapter 22.52.

Use exceptions:

The following uses are prohibited in the proposed ordinance for mixed use developments in certain commercial zones: adult entertainment/businesses; automotive or other vehicle repair, services, painting, storage, or upholstery, or the repair of engines, including automobiles, boats, motorcycles, trucks, or recreational vehicles; air pollution sampling stations; butane and propane service stations; car washes, automatic, coin operated, and hand wash; correctional institutions; dry cleaning plants, wholesale; earth stations; electric distribution substations, including microwave facilities; gas distribution depots, public utility; gas, industrial, including oxygen, acetylene, argon, carbon dioxide and similar gases in Interstate Commerce Commission approved-type cylinders; gas metering and control stations, public utility; hospitals; laundry plants, wholesale; live entertainment; juvenile halls; nightclub; shooting galleries; storage or shipping of flammable liquids or hazardous materials beyond that normally associated with a residential use; telephone repeater stations; welding, machining, or open flame work.

The proposed ordinance subjects the following uses for mixed use developments in certain commercial zones to permit: assaying; auction houses; automobile rental and leasing agencies; automobile sales;

bakery good distributors; boat and other marine sale; communications equipment building; dog training schools; furniture transfer and storage; ice sales; laboratories, research, and testing; lodge halls; mobilehome sales; mortuaries; motion picture studios; motorcycle, motor scooter, and trail bike sales; parcel delivery terminals; radio and television broadcasting studios; recording studios; rental services; recreational vehicle rentals; recreational vehicle sales; trailer rentals, box and utility only; trailer sales, box and utility; taxidermists; tool rentals; truck rentals, excluding trucks with a capacity greater than two tons.

Provided that all development and performance standards for joint live and work units are met, the proposed ordinance permits the following uses for joint live and work units in certain commercial zones: antiques; architecture and building design; art studio, including painting and sculpturing; bookbinding; cartooning and animation; ceramics; clothing, design and sewing of; commercial art; costume designing; engraving of metal products; furniture, the crafting and assembly of; glass, the hand production of, including glass blowing, glass, crystal, and art novelties, and the assembly of stained art glass; graphic design and display studio; interior decorating; jewelry, the creation of; leatherwork, using previously tanned leather; musical instruments, the creation and assembly of; offices for accountants, attorneys, computer software and multimedia professionals, consultants, insurance agents, real estate agents, travel agents, ornamental metal, provided that there are no forging works or any process used in bending or shaping; photography studio; picture mounting and framing; pottery, the throwing of; printing and publishing; shoes, footwear, the fabrication of; signs; silk screen processing; textile weaving, hand looms only; toys, the production of; transcription studios; watchmaking; woodcarving; wood products, the crafting of; the manufacture of the following products (in C-M only): aluminum, electronic appliances, bone, canvas, cloth, cosmetics (excluding soap), felt, fur, glass (provided no crucible shall exceed a capacity of 16 sq ft), instruments, jewelry, leather, metals (rare, precious or semi-precious), metal plating, optical goods, paper, perfume, plastic, shell, stone, textile, toiletries, wicker and bamboo, and yarn (excluding the dyeing of yarn).

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 and 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.

The list below references potential statutory and categorical exemptions that may apply to the mixed use projects facilitated by this project. Due to the CEQA exemptions available for affordable housing, small housing projects and infill housing, 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.

PRC, Division 13, Chapter 4.5, Article 6. Special Review of Housing Projects:
§ 21159.21 Exemption for qualified housing projects
§ 21159.23 Exemption for affordable low-income housing
§ 21159.24 Division not applicable to certain projects; exceptions

CCR, Title 14, Chapter 3, Article 18. Statutory Exemptions:
§ 15332 In-Fill Developments Projects.

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 mixed use projects consistent with the General Plan and 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. The mixed use projects facilitated by this ordinance, particularly joint live and work units, would promote the jobs-housing balance by putting jobs in proximity to housing. In addition, mixed use projects combine primarily neighborhood-serving commercial uses with residential uses, which promote more pedestrian-oriented activities and relatively less reliance on automobiles. 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 project is consistent with the General Plan and Housing Element by encouraging mixed use projects in commercially designated areas, and offering the appropriate incentives, such as permit streamlining, to encourage more diversity of housing types and more housing opportunities in the unincorporated areas. In addition, the ordinance encourages a combination of residential and commercial uses that are relatively less intensive than the uses that are already allowed in commercial zones.

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 mixed use 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 mixed use projects that would not be developed without the adoption of the amendments.

Draft 3/21/07

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

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: RADV T2006-00007 Mixed Use Ordinance

1. DESCRIPTION: The project RADV T2006-00009 consists of the adoption of an ordinance amending Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code (Planning and Zoning) pertaining to mixed-use projects. The amendments to Title 22 modify certain commercial zones (C-H Commercial Highway, C-1 Restricted Business Zone, C-2 Neighborhood Business, C-3 Unlimited Commercial, C-M Commercial Manufacturing) to allow mixed use projects, including mixed use (residential/commercial) developments and joint live and work units, through an administrative procedure; add development and performance standards for mixed-use projects; prohibit or make certain commercial uses, otherwise allowed by-right, subject to permit in mixed use projects; allow certain less intensive commercial uses in joint live and work units; and restructure various sections of Title 22 for consistency and ease of use.

2. LOCATION: Countywide.

3. PROPONENT: Initiated by the Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission.

4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:
BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

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

PREPARED BY: Connie Chung, AICP, Acting Senior Planning Assistant
Housing Section

DATE: 3/21/07

Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
Housing Section

Addendum to the Draft Mixed Use Ordinance Initial Study and Negative Declaration

An Initial Study was prepared for the mixed use ordinance, in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the Environmental Document Reporting Guidelines of the County of Los Angeles. The Initial Study shows that there is no substantial evidence that the ordinance would have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning prepared a Negative Declaration for the mixed use ordinance.

The following are points of clarification and corrections to the Initial Study.

1. The revised draft ordinance (the project) includes provisions that do not allow mixed use projects through a director's review if the mixed use project is located in any of the following: Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs); Environmentally Significant Habitat Areas (ESHAs); Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones; on land with a slope of 25% or more; and on land not served by a public water and sewer system. These provisions further lessen the potential to have a significant impact on the environment.

2. The revised draft ordinance (the project) clarifies that mixed use projects are permitted through a ministerial procedure, provided that they meet all of the use exceptions, development standards and performance standards described in the project. In addition, the project clarifies that mixed use projects that fall outside of those parameters are subject to a discretionary procedure and the appropriate environmental review, which would be evaluated on a project-by-project basis.

3. Under "Services-1. Traffic/Access-Other Considerations," on page 20, the sentence that references traffic mitigation fees should be corrected to indicate that traffic mitigation measures would be requested, as needed, which would be determined on a project-by-project basis.

   There is a body of research that suggests that mixed use projects exhibit fewer vehicle trips than single-use, free-standing sites, and that travelers' trip-making decisions are influenced by contextual factors, such as density, diversity of uses, etc. (Source: Transportation Research Board, "Enhancing Internal Trip Capture Estimation for Mixed-Use Developments." http://www.trb.org/TRBNet/ProjectDisplay.asp?ProjectID=927)

Prepared by: Connie Chung, AICP, Acting Senior Planning Assistant, Housing Section
Approved by: Julie Moore, AICP, Supervising Regional Planner, Housing Section