

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements ensures that the project will not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

The City of Pasadena maintains a citywide emergency response plan, which goes into effect at the onset of a major disaster (e.g., a major earthquake). The Fire Marshall maintains the disaster plan. In case of a disaster, the Fire Marshall is responsible for implementing the plan, and the Pasadena Police Department devises evacuation routes based on the specific circumstance of the emergency.

The City has pre-planned evacuation routes for dam inundation areas associated with Devil's Gate Dam, Eaton Wash, and the Jones Reservoir. According to the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the General Plan Plate 3-1, the project site is not within any of these dam inundation areas.

There are no areas in the City designated as eligible for flood insurance by the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA). No impact is expected.

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

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the General Plan, Plate 4-2 Wildfire Hazard Map, the project site is in an area of low fire hazard. The project is located approximately 0.60 miles from Fire Station #32 at 2424 E. Villa Street (located on the southeast corner of Carmelo Avenue and Villa Street). Project plans must be reviewed and approved by the Building Division and the Fire Department prior to issuance of any permits. Existing fire protection services are available to serve the project, and the project will not substantially increase demand for such services. Impact will be less than significant.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ()

WHY? The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project must comply with federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act) National Pollution Disposal Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements and the City's Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations.

There are no bodies of water near the project, whose surface waters would receive any discharge from the project. However, if there is water runoff from the site, this runoff may be discharged via Los County Flood Control Channels into the San Pedro Bay.

The project is not located near any significant body of fresh or marine water.

The applicant will be required to submit to the Department of Public Works and Building Division a grading plan and drainage plan and the hydrology study for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit, showing compliance with the City's National Pollution Disposal Elimination System (NPDES) permits. The grading and drainage plan and the hydrology study shall be prepared by an engineer registered in the State of California. The hydrology study shall include calculations for the quantities of storm runoff for the pre-development and post-development conditions and how drainage will be handled. On-site drainage shall be connected to an off-site drainage system. The applicant will be required to utilize standard measures, such as scheduling grading during the dry season, using hay or non-toxic chemicals to stabilize exposed soils, cleaning up at the end of each day, and/or other

methods to limit the amount of sediment and construction debris carried away by runoff during construction. Compliance with this standard requirement will ensure a less than significant impact over the short term.

Currently, the site is developed with an auto repair garage, an office/industrial building, a self-storage facility with parking. The project will not increase the area of on-site impervious surfaces, resulting in increased stormwater runoff during the long term. The applicant will be required to comply with the City's Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan (SUSMP) requirements, which compel the first ¼ of an inch of stormwater be cleansed prior to discharge. Since existing on-site runoff is not subject to SUSMP requirements, the project is expected to improve the quality of on-site surface.

Prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading, or construction permits for this project, the developer shall submit a detailed plan indicating the method of SUSMP compliance. Due to the existing building regulations and the submission, and approval and implementation of a drainage plan, there will be no significant impact from surface runoff.

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

WHY? The project will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power and the existing sewer provided by the Department of Public Works. Therefore, there will be no direct additions or withdrawals from the ground waters. Moreover there is no known aquifer condition in the project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation for the project.

Under normal operation the project will use approximately 10,052 gallons of water per day. The source of some of the water from the Pasadena Water and Power Department is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin.

During drought conditions, the project must comply with the Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance (Chapter 13 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) and shall consume 90% of expected consumption.

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

WHY? The project building footprint will cover approximately 71% of the site as compared to the present use, which occupies 53% of the site. Storm and other water runoff will therefore increase.

Increased paving or building footprint will reduce water percolating into the soil to replenish the water table and will increase storm and irrigation water flowing into storm drain facilities. However, the drainage of surface water from the project will be controlled by building regulations and directed towards the City's existing streets, flood control channels, storm drains and catch basins. The applicant shall submit a site drainage plan for review and approval by the Building Division and the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of a building permit. Due to the existing building regulations and the submission, approval and implementation of a drainage plan there will be no significant impact from surface runoff.

According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City of Pasadena Comprehensive General Plan, most properties in the City are not normally subject to flooding. Properties near the base of the San Gabriel Mountains might be subject to flooding.

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena contains two streams the Arroyo Seco and Eaton Creek; the project is not located near either stream. The project will not substantially alter the course of these streams or any ravines or gullies on the site. No impact is expected.

e. *Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? ()*

WHY? The project site is adequately served by existing stormwater drainage systems. The applicant will be required to submit to the Department of Public Works and Building Division a grading plan and drainage plan and the hydrology study for review and approval prior to the issuance of a building permit, showing compliance with the City's National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits. The grading and drainage plan and the hydrology study shall be prepared by an engineer registered in the State of California. The hydrology study shall include calculations for the quantities of storm runoff for the pre-development and post-development conditions and how drainage will be handled. On-site drainage shall be connected to an off-site drainage system. The applicant will be required to utilize standard measures, such as scheduling grading during the dry season, using hay or non-toxic chemicals to stabilize exposed soils, cleaning up at the end of each day, and/or other methods to limit the amount of sediment and construction debris carried away by runoff during construction. Compliance with this standard requirement will ensure a less than significant impact over the short term.

f. *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? ()*

WHY? The project will not substantially degrade water quality during construction or operation. Runoff will be controlled during construction using required Best Management Practices. There are no known hazardous materials that would be disturbed during construction. The project will be connected to the existing water, sewer and storm drain systems so there will be no direct impact on groundwater quality. No impact is expected.

g. *Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or dam inundation area as shown in the City of Pasadena adopted Safety Element of the General Plan or other flood or inundation delineation map? ()*

WHY? According to the Dam and Water Resources Map Plate 3-1 of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's adopted General Plan, the project is not located in a dam inundation area. No impact is expected.

h. *Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows? ()*

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? The entire City of Pasadena is in Zone D on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) map Community Number 065050. In Zone D the City is not required to implement any flood plain management regulations. According to the State of California Seismic Hazard Zone map, Pasadena, Mt. Wilson Quadrangle, the project site is not in an area subject to either liquefaction or earthquake-induced landslides. The 2002 adopted Safety Element of the General Plan Plate 1-3 does not show the project site to be located in an area subject to liquefaction or earthquake-induced landslides. The 2002 adopted Safety Element of the General Plan, Plate 2-4 Slope Distribution Map, also shows that the project site is in an area where the slopes are less than 10-degrees. Any slope instability will be controlled by existing City regulations; therefore impact will be less than significant. As required, the applicant shall submit to the Building Division a soils report for review and approval. See responses to Geology and Soils 9.a. iii and 9.b.iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides and 9.b soil erosion and the response to 11.i below.

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

WHY? According to the Dam and Water Resources Map Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's adopted General Plan, the project is not located in a dam inundation area. No impact is expected.

There are no significant bodies of water either in or near the City of Pasadena, which could subject the City to tidal waves. An on-site drainage system will convey storm water runoff to designated flood control facilities.

- j. *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?* ()

WHY? The City of Pasadena is not located near any inland bodies of water or the Pacific Ocean to be inundated by either a seiche or tsunami. The 2002 adopted Safety Element of the General Plan Plate 1-3 does not show the project site to be located in an area subject to liquefaction or earthquake-induced landslides. The 2002 adopted Safety Element of the General Plan, Plate 2-4 Slope Distribution Map, also shows that the project site is in an area where the slopes are less than 10-degrees. Any slope instability will be controlled by existing City regulations; therefore impact will be less than significant. As required, the applicant shall submit to the Building Division a soils report for review and approval.

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- a. *Physically divide an existing community?* ()

WHY? The project will not physically divide an existing community. The proposal is an expansion of an existing use which will be contained within the existing property boundaries. There is no new or additional parcel involved in this application. Further, warehousing and storage use allowed under the original PD plan has been in operation at this site in a manner that has been compatible with other commercial uses in the area.

The General Plan Land Use element identifies the project site as General Commercial. The self-storage facility is consistent with the General Plan land use designation, as shown in the adopted 1994 Land Use Element. The project site is zone Planned Development (PD-11 Foothill Boulevard, Craig Avenue, and White Street). Under this zoning, all regulations not specifically stated are deferred to the base district CG (General Commercial). On January 2003, the Pasadena City Council adopted an ordinance prohibiting new construction of self-storage facilities in the CL (Limited Commercial), CG (General Commercial), IG (General Industrial), and CD (Central District) zoning districts. The self-

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

storage use at this site predates the ordinance adopted by the City Council; therefore, the self-storage facility became a nonconforming use. Pursuant to Chapter 17.76 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, a Conditional Use Permit is required for the expansion of nonconforming uses.

As part of a future expansion, the applicant is proposing an amendment to the original PD plan to construct a four-story, 77,650-square foot self-storage structure with 23 parking spaces in an area previously designated for parking. The amendment, if approved, will provide for additional square footage and continuation of the existing used on the eastern portion of the site. Following approval of the PD amendment, a Conditional Use Permit application is required for the expansion of the self-storage facility as a nonconforming use.

The applicant has submitted an application to modify the PD-11 plan (Phase 3) for the eastern portion of the site to allow for the construction of a 30-foot high, 46,200-square foot self-storage facility. As originally proposed, the height of the Phase 3 self-storage building was 45 feet with 77,650 square feet. The applicant is proposing to modify the Phase 3 self-storage building by reducing the height and square footage from 45 feet to 30 feet and 77,650 square feet to 46,200 square feet. The proposed modification would not physically divide an existing community.

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

WHY? The General Plan Land Use element identifies the project site as General Commercial. The self-storage facility is consistent with the General Plan land use designation, as shown in the adopted 1994 Land Use Element. The project site is zone Planned Development (PD-11). According to this PD, all regulations not specifically stated in the planned development are deferred to the base commercial district (CG). On January 2003, the Pasadena City Council adopted an ordinance prohibiting new construction of self-storage facilities in commercial zones, including the CG (General Commercial) zoning districts. The self-storage use predates the ordinance adopted by the City Council; therefore, the self-storage facility became a nonconforming use. Pursuant to Chapter 17.76 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, expansion of nonconforming uses are allowed with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit. Therefore, in accordance with Section 17.76.030 "Alterations and enlargements of nonconforming uses and structures", the applicant has submitted an application for a Conditional Use Permit to expand the existing self-storage facility. See also 12.a.

An expansion of the existing use (self-storage) to the easterly portion of the site is proposed as part of a future development (Phase 3) on the site. An amendment to the original PD plan will mitigate the impact by establishing standards that are consistent with the intent of the PD zone. Following approval of the PD amendment, a Conditional Use Permit application is required for the expansion of the self-storage facility as a nonconforming use.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan (HCP) or natural community conservation plan (NCCP)? ()

WHY? As of July 2003, there was no Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans in Pasadena. No impact is expected.

13. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. 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? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The Final Environmental Impact Report for the adopted 1994 Land Use and Mobility Elements of the City's General Plan states that there are two areas in Pasadena, which may contain mineral resources of sand, gravel and stone Eaton Wash, and Devils Gate Reservoir. The project is not near these areas. No impact is expected.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? There are no locally important mineral-resource recovery sites delineated by the City of Pasadena Land Use Element of the Comprehensive General Plan. The 1994 certified final EIR for this element states that there are two areas within Pasadena which contain aggregate for making Portland cement, one in the Arroyo Seco, the other in Eaton Canyon. These areas are zoned for Open Space uses and are not currently being mined. There are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan. The 1999 "Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology shows no aggregate resources within the City of Pasadena.

14. NOISE. Will the project result in:

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? The project itself will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. Noise generated by construction activities may have a short-term impact and noise from air conditioning and heating systems may increase the existing level of ambient noise after construction. Significant long-term impacts are not anticipated. The project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction, noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment, and the allowed level of ambient noise (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code).

Regulations in the Municipal Code regarding ambient noise levels apply to stationary noise sources. The Noise Restrictions Ordinance does not regulate traffic noise.

The impact from construction noise will be short-term and limited to normal working hours (7 a.m. to 9 p.m. Monday through Saturday in or within 500 feet of a residential area) in accordance with City regulations. A construction related traffic plan would be required to ensure that truck routes for transportation of materials and equipment are established with consideration for sensitive uses in the neighborhood. A traffic and parking plan for the construction phase will be submitted for approval to the Traffic Engineer in the Public Works and Transportation Department and to the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of any permits.

The project must comply with the City's Noise Restrictions Ordinance (Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code) and the California Sound Transmission Control Standards (CAC, Title 24, building Standards, Chapter 12 Appendix Section 1208A). According to the Noise Restrictions Ordinance the allowed ambient noise level in which the project is located (Noise District III) is 60 dBA during the day (6a.m.-11 p.m.) and 50 dBA at night (11 p.m. to 6 a.m.).

The 2002 adopted Noise Element of the Comprehensive General Plan contains objectives and policies to help minimize the effects of noise from different sources. According to Figure 1, Guidelines for Noise Compatible Land Use, of this element this project should be located in an area with a clearly to normally acceptable ambient noise range of 50-70 dBA. Land uses that are considered to be noise sensitive include but are not limited to: residences, hotels,

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

single room occupancy buildings, group care and convalescent homes, schools, churches, libraries, performance halls, parks and hospitals.

b. *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?* ()

WHY? The project is not located near any light rail tracks or adjacent to a freeway. No impact is expected.

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

WHY? See response to 14.a. The Noise Restrictions Ordinance (Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36) sets the allowed ambient noise level. The project will not increase ambient noise levels

d. *A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?* ()

WHY? The project will not cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. No impact is expected.

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

WHY? As of July 2003, there were no airports or airport land use plans within the City of Pasadena. Pasadena is part of the Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena Airport Authority, but the airport is in the City of Burbank. No impact is expected.

f. *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?* ()

WHY? The project is not within the vicinity of the Police Heliport or the Fire Camp in the Arroyo Seco. No impact is expected.

15. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

WHY? The project is in a developed area where all the major infrastructure is in place. The project may result in a potential net gain of 5 persons to the residential population. Improvements needed to connect this project to the existing infrastructure will be the responsibility of the applicant. Since the project is in conformance with the existing General Plan and zoning land-use designations, this gain will not be significant.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ()

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The project does not involve the demolition of any housing units nor will it displace substantial number of existing housing.

Using generation figures from the 1990 "Transportation Housing and Child Care Survey" taken in Pasadena, the net gain of five employees would create a need for one housing unit. The survey found that approximately 45.9% of Pasadena employees rent or lease their housing; therefore there might be a demand for one rental unit. Units to house employees, who move to the City, might be found among existing vacant units or from new units built within the City.

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ()

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The proposed will not involve the demolition of any housing units; therefore, the project would not displace any people.

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

a. Fire Protection? ()

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

WHY? The project site is located in a low wildfire hazard area according to the Wildfire Hazard Map (Plate 4-2) of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan. The project is located 0.7 miles from Fire Station #32 at 2424 E. Villa Street (southeast corner of Villa Street and Carmelo Avenue). Project plans must be reviewed and approved by the Building Division and the Fire Department prior to issuance of any permits. Existing fire protection services are available to serve the project, and the project will not substantially increase demand for such services. Impact will be less than significant.

b. Libraries? ()

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

WHY? The project is located one mile from the nearest branch library. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System. No impact is expected.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

c. Parks? ()

WHY? The project is located 0.9 mile from the nearest park, Villa Park. According to Parks and Natural Resources staff, the City as a whole had 1.6 acres of parkland per 1000 residents in May 2002. The state standard in the Quimby Act is 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents.

The project may increase the residential population by five (5) households. Addition of these households will not have a negative impact on parks.

d. Police Protection? ()

WHY? The proposed site is in an area which has reported low crime rates according to Police Department burglary statistics. The project will not increase the need for police protection. However, the effect on police service is not significant, since this change is within the Police Department's scope of responsibility. Impact will be less than significant.

e. Schools? ()

WHY? The City of Pasadena collects a Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) Construction tax on all new construction. Payment of this fee mitigates any impacts on schools.

The project may generate five (5) employees of which one will move to Pasadena. According to the 1990 Nexus Survey of Employees, of these employees 34.58% or two (2) will have children under 13 years of age. Each employee with children has an average of 1.71 children; therefore approximately three (3) children who are or will be of school age could enroll in the Pasadena Unified School District. This is not a significant impact on the District.

In FY 2004 a school development impact fee of \$0.33 per square foot is collected on commercial construction of projects exceeding 500 square feet (\$.03 is collected on self-storage uses). This fee helps pay for the cost of new children enrolling in the school district as a result of commercial development. Public facilities, public schools and churches are exempt from this fee.

f. Other public facilities? ()

WHY? The project's development may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. However, the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees, increased property taxes (and additional sales tax), and development fees will lower this impact to a level that is not significant.

17. RECREATION.

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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? The project is located 0.9 mile from the nearest park, Villa Parke. Recreational opportunities in the vicinity have already been established and the proposed project of the expansion of a nonconforming use, self-storage facility, will not impact their quality or quantity. The park, Villa Park, can absorb this potential increase in use. The project may generate one resident to the community who may use neighborhood and regional parks. No impact is expected.

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? ()

WHY? The project contains no recreational facilities. The proposed project is an expansion of a nonconforming use (self-storage facility) with the construction of 83,100-square feet for Phase 2 and the amendment to the PD-11 zoning district to allow for the construction of 77,650-square feet for Phase 3. No impact is expected.

The applicant has submitted an application to modify the PD-11 plan (Phase 3) for the eastern portion of the site to allow for the construction of a 30-foot high, 46,200-square foot self-storage facility. As originally proposed, the height of the Phase 3 self-storage building was 45 feet with 77,650 square feet. The applicant is proposing to modify the Phase 3 self-storage by reducing the height and square footage from 45 feet to 30 feet and 77,650 square feet to 46,200 square feet. The proposed modification does not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

18. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? ()

WHY? The project is located on a street (Foothill Boulevard) that is identified as a Principal Mobility Corridor in the 1994 adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan. In the conceptually adopted 2003 Mobility Element, Foothill Boulevard is also designated as a Principal Mobility.

A traffic report has been prepared for both the expansion proposed under Conditional Use Permit (Phase 2) and the future expansion (Phase 3) to be considered under the PD amendment. The traffic report is included as Appendix A. The traffic study indicates a -54 net total trip generation from the Phase 2; this is due to the demolition of existing structures on the site (1,125-square foot automotive repair garage, 2,880-square foot office/industrial, 10,280-square foot office/industrial, and 400-square foot storage area). For the Phase 3 expansion the traffic study indicates a generation of 199 net total trips.

Potential impacts on the following three intersections were analyzed by the study: (1) Foothill Boulevard/Craig Avenue; (2) Foothill Boulevard/Sierra Madre Boulevard; and (3) Walnut Street/Foothill Boulevard.

The traffic study for concludes that the: (1) Construction of the proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant transportation impacts at three study intersections; (2) In the Cumulative (Future Year 2007) Base conditions, future conditions without the implementation of the proposed expansion project, all three analyzed intersections would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the weekday morning and evening peak hours; (3) In the Cumulative (Future Year 2007) plus Project conditions, both A.M. and P.M. peak hour operating conditions would be similar to those projected for the Cumulative Base conditions. All three analyzed intersections will continue to operate

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

at acceptable levels of service; and (4) The Cumulative (Future Year 2007) plus Project conditions show that the proposed project would not cause any significant traffic impacts at any of the analyzed locations.

b. *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?* ()

WHY? The adopted 2002 Congestion Management Program prepared by the Metropolitan Transportation Agency lists LOS E as acceptable for the highway and road system. The project is not located within a highway or road system as defined in the 2002 Congestion Management Program. The project will not impact this road system.

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

WHY? The project site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

As of July 2003 the nearest public use airport is in Burbank, which is operated by a Joint Powers Authority with representatives from the Cities of Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena. Helipads are required on many high-rise buildings for evacuating occupants in case of an emergency. The police heliport is located at the eastern edge of the Arroyo Seco near the City's border with Altadena. This heliport is not open for public use. No impact is expected.

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

WHY? The project has been evaluated by the Transportation Department and its impact on circulation due to the proposed use and its design, has been found not to be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the project or in the vicinity of the project. No impact is expected.

e. *Result in inadequate emergency access?* ()

WHY? The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the Transportation Department and was determined found to be adequate for emergency access and access to nearby uses. The project must comply with all Building, Fire and Safety Codes and plans are subject to review and approval by the Department of Public Works, Transportation Department, Building Division, and Fire Department. No impact is expected.

f. *Result in inadequate parking capacity?* ()

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? Due to the increased intensity of land use, there will be an increased demand for parking. The parking proposed for Phase 2 is 11 parking spaces. According to the Zoning Code, the project would be required to provide 33 parking spaces. The parking proposed for Phase 3 is 23 parking spaces while the Code requires 31 parking spaces. Therefore, the applicant is requesting a parking variance.

A parking study has been prepared for the proposed expansion under Phase 2 and Phase 3 of this project, which is included as Appendix B. The study analyzed weekday and Saturday parking demands at the existing on-site parking lots and at three other sites within the City of Pasadena, with similar characteristics to the proposed project.

In addition to other findings, the parking study concluded that the proposed self-storage facility expansion project would generate a peak demand of 7 parking spaces on Saturdays. The project is proposing to provide 11 parking spaces to serve the expansion component of the facility, which would be adequate. The access and circulation systems at this proposed project's surface parking lot are adequate and will function satisfactorily.

The proposed amendment to the PD plan for the Phase 3 expansion would have similar characteristics, square footage, and similar operation as Phase 2. With the propose expansion similar to Phase 2, it is determined that the expansion would yield the same results generating a peak demand of 7 parking spaces.

A detailed parking study was prepared to assess the parking needs of the self-storage facility and established the adequate parking ratio for this type of facility. The study analyzed weekday and Saturday parking demands at the existing on-site parking lots and at three other self-storage sites within Pasadena, with similar characteristics to the proposed project. Based on the observed weekday and Saturday parking demands, the peak parking demand rates were determined and the potential peak parking demand of the proposed project was estimated. In addition to other findings, the study concluded that provision of parking at a ratio of 1.46 parking spaces per 10,000 square feet would supply the demand generated by the self-storage uses. Applying this ratio to the self-storage use under the PD would require 40 parking spaces. The retail component (1,800 square feet) allowed under this amendment will require 2.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet for a total of 5 parking spaces. The 5,000 square-foot office would require 15 spaces (3 spaces per 1,000 square feet). The total number of spaces that would be required for all the uses is 60 parking spaces; the applicant is proposing to provide a minimum of 67.

The applicant has submitted an application to modify the PD-11 plan (Phase 3) for the eastern portion of the site to allow for the construction of a 30-foot high, 46,200-square foot self-storage facility. As originally proposed, the height of the Phase 3 self-storage building was 45 feet with 77,650 square feet. The applicant is proposing to modify the Phase 3 self-storage building by reducing the height and square footage from 45 feet to 30 feet and 77,650 square feet to 46,200 square feet; thus, reducing the number of required parking spaces. Also as part of the submittal, the applicant has eliminated the retail component under the PD-11 amendment, which further reduces the amount of required parking.

Based on the reduction of height and square footage for the modification to the PD-11 plan, and applying the ratio of 1.46 parking spaces per 10,000 square feet for the self-storage square footage onsite, the use would require 37 parking spaces. The 5,000-square foot office would require 15 spaces (3 spaces per 1,000 square feet). The total number of spaces that would be required for all the uses onsite is 52 parking spaces; the applicant is proposing to provide a minimum of 52. There will be no parking impacts.

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

WHY? The proposed project will not result in a substantial impact upon the existing transportation system.

The project is on a principal mobility corridor (Foothill Boulevard) according to the 1994 adopted Mobility Element of the General Plan. The project is located near MTA bus route #177 and near the Gold Line light rail line station on

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Allen Avenue and the Foothill Freeway (210 Fwy.) from Downtown Los Angeles to Pasadena according to the adopted 1994 Mobility Element of the General Plan. See also 18.a. and 18.b.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? ()

WHY? The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater; individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line. The City is within Los Angeles County Sanitation District 16. There are not unusual wastes in the project's wastewater, which cannot be treated by L.A. County Sanitation District. No impact is expected.

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

WHY? The project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The City's Water and Power Department is responsible for water and water treatment facilities.

Los Angeles County treats the City's wastewater; individual projects are subject to a Los Angeles County fee when the project is hooked up to a sewer line.

The Pasadena Water and Power Department, Water Division, can serve water to this project site. There is several water services to this project site, two 3/4-inch water service, two 1-inch water service, a 4-inch water service, and a 6-inch fire service. The Water Division has indicated that these services may not be sufficient for the proposed project and must be abandoned. The Water Division has also indicated that the size of the new service(s) necessary will be determined per the Uniform Plumbing Code when final building plans are submitted. Therefore, no impact is expected.

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

WHY? The project will not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. The project is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins. The project development will not result in the need for a new or substantial alteration to the existing drainage system.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Further, the project must have an on-site drainage plan approved by the Building Official and the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building permits. Any on-site improvements needed to provide drainage or to connect the project with the existing City drainage system are the responsibility of the applicant.

The project is subject to the requirements of the City's Storm Water and Urban runoff Control Regulation Ordinance that implements the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board's Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Prior to the issuance of any demolition, grading, or construction permits for this project, the developer shall submit a detailed plan indicating the method of SUSMP compliance.

The City of Pasadena through Ordinance 6837 adopted the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan recommended by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. This ordinance enables the City to be part of the municipal storm sewer permit issued by the Los Angeles Region to the County of Los Angeles. The City Council is committed to adopting any changes made to the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation by the California regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region. Impact will be less than significant.

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

WHY? According to the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department, there are sufficient water supplied available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. The adequacy of water supply is a potential problem for all new development since the Southern California region has been known to experience periods of drought and needs a long-term reliable water supply. This project will result in water consumption of 10,174 gallons per day. The current use consumes approximately 7,247 gallons of water per day. The proposed use would have a decrease in water consumption of 2,927 gallons of water per day. However, this project will be required to comply with the City's Water Shortage Procedures Ordinance during periods of drought, thereby reducing monthly consumption to 90 percent of the expected consumption for this type of land use. Further, the Water Division of the Pasadena Water and Power Department has reviewed this project and determined that the City can serve it. Installation of plumbing will be inspected by a Building Division Code Enforcement Inspector prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. Compliance with this standard procedure will ensure a less than significant impact.

The project does not affect any of the local groundwater recharge spreading grounds. The project is not expected to result in unusual runoff that could affect groundwater quality. The project will be required to comply with the City's Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan (SUSMP) requirements, which compel the first 3/4 of an inch of stormwater be cleansed prior to discharge. The project will not change the quality, direction or rate of flow of groundwater or introduce any substances into it.

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

WHY? See responses to 19 a. and b.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? ()

Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--	---	------------------

WHY? The project can be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The City of Pasadena is served primarily by Scholl Canyon landfill, which as of July 2003 has a 22-year capacity, and secondarily by Puente Hills, which was re-permitted in 2003 for 10 years.

The project is located in a developed urban area and within the City's refuse collection area. The project will not result in the need for a new or in substantial alteration to the existing system of solid waste collection and disposal.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? ()

WHY? The project will comply with applicable statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

The applicant is required to submit a program to the Department of Public Works Solid Waste for recycling solid waste. This program must be approved by the Public Works Solid Waste Division prior to the issuance of any building permits. The program must contain recycling for office paper, corrugated cardboard, mixed glass and green waste.

In 1992, the City adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This act requires a 25% reduction in solid waste before 1995 and a 50% reduction before 2001, based on the solid waste generated in 1990.

In accordance with the Construction and Demolition Ordinance, Chapter 8.62 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, the applicant must submit a Construction Waste Management Plan, if the project meets any of the following thresholds:

1. Residential additions of 1,000 or more gross square feet;
2. Tenant improvement of 3,000 or more square feet;
3. New structures of 1,000 or more gross square feet;
4. Demolition of 1,000 or more gross square feet; and
5. All City public works and construction projects, which are awarded pursuant to competitive bid procedure established by Chapter 4.08 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

20. EARLIER ANALYSIS.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 18 at the end of the checklist.

a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

On April 18, 1994 and May 16, 1994, the City of Pasadena adopted its Revised General Plan's Mobility and Land Use Elements, respectively. A Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was adopted. A Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was adopted. This program EIR focused its analysis on Land Use; Population, Employment and Housing; Transportation and Circulation; geology; Hydrology and Water Quality; Air Quality; Noise; Biological Resources; Utilities; Public Services; Aesthetic/Visual Impacts; and Cultural Resources. For all these impacts, the EIR identified mitigation measures that would reduce the potential impact to insignificant levels. The revised Mobility Element, which was approved in concept by the City Council April 7, 2003, does not list the lowest acceptable LOS as of October 2003. A traffic study and parking study was submitted for the project and is attached as Appendix A and Appendix B. Some of the following documents listed on page 35 in analyzing the Initial Study. *In addition, this document is an addendum to a previously certified Mitigated Negative Declaration – italicized text represents the new or revised information contained in this analysis.*

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

#	Document
1	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code, revised January 1, 1994 official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999.
2	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Maps- the official Los Angeles and Mt. Wilson, quadrant maps were released in 1977.
3	CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993
4	East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001
5	Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983
6	Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002
7	Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 1994
8	2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002.
9	Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868
10	Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1994
11	Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1994
12	Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
13	Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854
14	North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997
15	Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994
16	Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
17	Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975
18	Seismic Hazard Maps, California Department of Conservation, official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999. The preliminary map for Condor Peak was released in 2002.
19	South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998
20	State of California "Aggregate Resource in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" by David J. Beeby, Russell V. Miller, Robert L. Hill, and Robert E. Grunwald, Miscellaneous map no. .010, copyright 1999, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology
21	Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations n Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837
22	Transportation, Housing, and Child Care Survey: A Report Describing the Results and Findings of a Survey of Employees in the City of Pasadena, Child Care Planning Associates for the City of Pasadena, April 11, 1990
23	Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896
24	West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001
25	Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code

A copy of the Final Program EIR, the traffic study and parking study, and the above documents are available for review at the City of Pasadena, Permit Center, Hale Building, Planning and Development Department, 175 North Garfield Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91109.

- b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis. Transportation/traffic – A traffic study was submitted for the project and analyzed. No mitigation measures for traffic were required for this project.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

- c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier documents and the extent to which address site-specific conditions for the project. N/A

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

WHY? As discussed in this Checklist, the project will not substantially degrade the quality of the environment. The project may eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history as discussed in item 7.a. Cultural Resource; but, however mitigation measures are proposed for the project. As discussed in Item 7.a. Cultural Resources, the building located at 2189 E. Foothill Blvd. appears to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places at the local level of significance. This building was built in 1952 and designed by a locally prominent architect, Harold J. Bissner (1901-1988). The building appears to qualify for the National Register under Criterion C, in that it embodies "the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction." The office portion of the building is a notable local example of Late Moderne/International Style architecture from the 1950's. The front portion of the building possesses a high level of integrity, and that it has no major alterations that would compromise its significance. The building represents one of two notable examples in Pasadena of high-style courtyard office building from the 1950s. Because the building's significance is based on the architectural style of the front of the building, staff determined that the removal of the rear portion would be a less than significant effect and would not jeopardize the significance of the front portion of the building.

Properties eligible for listing in the National Register are automatically considered historic resources subject to CEQA. If the effects of a project on a historic resource are significant and unavoidable, CEQA then requires mitigation or an EIR. The demolition of historic resources usually cannot be mitigated by mere documentation of the resource (CEQA Guideline 15126.4). The impact on the historic resource could be mitigated by its preservation and incorporation into the proposed project. Impacts on the preserved building could be mitigated through the design review process, which would ensure that the treatment of the preserved building is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and that the design of the proposed project is compatible in height, location, setback, scale, massing, and style. A bulky, windowless building will likely be incompatible in scale and massing; the challenge will be to find an appropriate transition in scale, landscape buffer, and other devices to respect the image and form of the historic building.

Proposed mitigation measures are as follows:

1. Revise the site plan to preserve the existing office portion of the building and its landscaped courtyard in front of the building at 2189 E. Foothill Blvd. The treatment of the office building shall follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation.
2. If the factory portion at the rear of the building is demolished, any new structure in that location shall be designed to be compatible with the historic resource.

The project site is located in an urbanized area and has been developed with an auto garage, office/industrial, and warehousing/self-storage facility for many years. No rare, threatened, or endangered biological resources are known to inhabit the site or used the site for migration or breeding. The project will not affect any fish, wildlife, or plant species, either directly or indirectly. The project will not threaten any plant or animal community or reduce the number or restrict the range of scarce or endangered plant or animal. Compliance with the City's requirements as discussed in this initial study will ensure a less than significant effect.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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

WHY? As discussed in this Initial Study, the project is an expansion of a legal nonconforming use (warehousing/self-storage) with the construction of 81,300-square feet for Phase 2 and an amendment to an existing Planned Development (PD-11) with the construction of 77,650-square feet for Phase 3 development. Following the approval of the PD amendment, a Conditional Use Permit application is required for the expansion of the self-storage facility as a nonconforming use.

Several future development projects are located east of this project site. As discussed throughout this Initial Study Checklist, all project impacts will be less than significant or no impact. No evidence exists suggesting that the project will substantially contribute to any cumulative impacts. In the case of air quality, mitigation measures for construction were identified. The mitigation measures imposed on the project would reduce the impacts to less than significant levels. In the case of traffic, it was concluded that the three study intersections, Foothill Boulevard/Craig Avenue, Foothill Boulevard/Sierra Madre Boulevard, and Walnut Street/Foothill Boulevard would not be significantly impacted by the proposed project during the A.M. and/or P.M. peak hours. The traffic report takes into account cumulative traffic effects of development projects in the area.

The CEQA's Guidelines (Section 15064(i)(2) indicate that a project's contribution to a significant cumulative impact may be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and thus not significant. Section 15064(i)(2) further states that when the project might contribute to a significant cumulative impact, but the contribution will be rendered less than cumulatively significant through mitigation measures. No mitigation measures were required for traffic. Standard City procedures and requirements address such potential impacts, as discussed through this Initial Study Checklist. In the case of long-term air quality impacts, the project does not meet the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) impact thresholds. Therefore, the project will not substantially contribute to potential cumulative impacts or result in cumulative considerable impacts.

c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? ()

WHY? As discussed throughout this Initial Study Checklist, the project will not result in significant environmental effects on human beings. In the case of air quality, mitigation measures for construction were identified to reduce the impacts to less than significant levels. In the case of transportation/traffic, the traffic study analysis concluded that the: (1) Construction of the proposed project is not anticipated to result in significant transportation impacts at three study intersections; (2) In the Cumulative (Future Year 2007) Base conditions, future conditions without the implementation of the proposed expansion project, all three analyzed intersections would continue to operate at an acceptable LOS D or better during the weekday morning and evening peak hours; (3) In the Cumulative (Future Year 2007) plus Project conditions, both A.M. and P.M. peak hour operating conditions would be similar to those projected for the Cumulative Base conditions. All three analyzed intersections will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service; and (4) The Cumulative (Future Year 2007) plus Project conditions show that the proposed project would not cause any significant traffic impacts at any of the analyzed locations. No mitigation measures were required for traffic. Existing rules and regulations are adequate to ensure that any hazardous materials on the site, such as asbestos and/or lead-based paint, are safely remediated. Therefore, the project will not substantially contribute to potential cumulative impacts or result in cumulative considerable impacts.

CITY OF PASADENA FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This final Mitigated Negative Declaration is based on the attached Initial Study and has been prepared in accordance with the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA – Public Resources Code Section 21000 *et seq.*), the *CEQA Guidelines* (California Code of Regulations, Section 15000 *et seq.*), and the City of Pasadena *CEQA Guidelines*. The draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated for a 20-day review period, April 1, 2004-April 21, 2004. Changes were incorporated in the final Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study prior to consideration by the Zoning Hearing Officer.

APPLICANT: Barnard Foothill I, LLC

APPLICANT ADDRESS: 2600 Mission Street, Suite 206
San Marino, CA 91108

REVIEW PERIOD: April 1, 2004 through April 21, 2004

DESCRIPTION: The applicant, Barnard Foothill I, LLC has submitted a Conditional Use Permit application to expand an existing self-storage building in the PD-11 (Planned Development-11, Foothill Boulevard, Craig Avenue and White Street) zoning district and a Variance application for the number of required parking spaces. The project site is zone PD-11 with an underlying base district of CG (General Commercial). All regulations not specifically stated in the PD-11 are deferred to the base district CG. On January 2003, the Pasadena City Council adopted an ordinance prohibiting new construction of self-storage facilities in commercial zones including the CG. The self-storage use predates the ordinance adopted by the City Council; thus the self-storage facility became a nonconforming use. Pursuant to Chapter 17.76 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, a Conditional Use Permit is required for the expansion of nonconforming uses.

The proposed expansion involves a 67,150-square foot building to be constructed on the southwestern end of the site. Two buildings are proposed to be demolished, 1,125-square foot automotive repair garage, a 2,880-square foot office/industrial, and 400-square feet of storage area. A historic building located at 2189 E. Foothill Boulevard will be preserved. The project also provides for 13 parking spaces.

In conjunction with the Conditional Use Permit, a parking Variance application was submitted for the project. According to the Zoning Code, 33 spaces are required. The project is providing 13 spaces, thus the Variance request.

As part of a future expansion to the easterly portion, the applicant is proposing to amend the PD plan contained in the PD-11 zoning district. This amendment proposes the construction of a three-story 46,200-square foot self-storage building with 16 parking spaces for Phase 3. Currently, the adopted 1986 PD-11 plan provides for a parking area. Ultimately, all the proposed buildings will bring the total floor area up to 261,000-square feet after demolition of the buildings noted above.

PROJECT ADDRESS: 2159-2233 E. Foothill Boulevard, northeast corner of Foothill Boulevard and Craig Avenue (see attached Initial Study for a local and regional location map).

ON THE BASIS OF THE ATTACHED INITIAL STUDY FOR THE PROJECT AND THE INCLUSION OF THE FOLLOWING MITIGATION MEASURES INTO THE PROJECT DESIGN, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT DOES NOT HAVE A POTENTIAL FOR A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT UPON THE ENVIRONMENT. COPIES OF DOCUMENTS REFERENCED IN THE INITIAL STUDY ARE AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW AT THE OFFICE OF

THE ENVIRONMENTAL ADMINISTRATOR, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT,
HALE BUILDING, 175 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE.

IN ACCORDANCE WITH CEQA (SECTION 21081.6) AND THE CEQA GUIDELINES (SECTIONS 15074 AND 15097), THE ZONING HEARING OFFICER SHALL ADOPT A MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM WHEN MAKING FINDINGS TO ADOPT THE FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

The following mitigation measures will ensure less-than-significant impacts in the environmental issue areas addressed below. As discussed in the attached Initial Study, no other potentially significant impacts will result due to the project.

IMPACT 1 – CULTURAL RESOURCES: cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

Mitigation Measures

1. Revise the site plan to preserve the existing office portion of the building and its landscaped courtyard in front of the building at 2189 E. Foothill Blvd. The treatment of the office building shall follow the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for rehabilitation.
2. If the factory portion at the rear of the building is demolished, any new structure in that location shall be designed to be compatible with the historic resource.

Monitoring Program Cost:

I HEREBY AGREE TO PAY THE CITY MONITORING FEES, AND IMPLEMENT THESE MITIGATION MEASURES, AT A MINIMUM, IN THE DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE PROJECT WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION.

APPLICANT

DATE