

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

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 proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building. The project would not install any groundwater wells, and would not otherwise directly withdraw any groundwater. In addition, there are no known aquifer conditions at the project site or in the surrounding area, which could be intercepted by excavation or development of the project. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically interfere with any groundwater supplies.

The existing office use will continue to use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power. The source of some of this water supply is ground water, stored in the Raymond Basin. Thus, the project could indirectly withdraw groundwater. However, the water usage will not increase because the existing land use and structure will not change. Water service provided by the Department of Water and Power will continue, therefore the project would not result in significant impacts from depletion of groundwater supplies. Under normal operation the existing office use consumes approximately 731 gallons of water per day.

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 proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building. The project site is currently virtually flat, and runoff onsite drains as sheet flow from north to south. The project site does not contain any discernable streams, rivers, or other drainage features. Any future development of the site will involve minor grading, but will not substantially alter the drainage pattern of the site or surrounding area.

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 proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building, thus, will not have any impact on the existing drainage pattern of the site or area.

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 proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building. The existing office building will continue to be used as office ancillary to the church,

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

thus, will not create or contribute runoff water, which might exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or cause substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

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

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

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building. As discussed above, the existing office building will continue to be used as office ancillary to the church, and is not a point-source generator of water pollutants. The only long-term water pollutants expected to be generated onsite are typical urban stormwater pollutants that do not substantially degrade water quality.

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?* ()

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

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate 3-1, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area.

The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building. Therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a flood hazard area or dam inundation area, and the project would have no related impacts.

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

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

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. The proposed zone change does not involve any change in use or change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building. Therefore, the proposed project would not place structures within the flow of the 100-year flood, and the project would have no related impacts.

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?* ()

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

WHY? No portions of the City of Pasadena are within a 100-year floodplain identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). As shown on FEMA map Community Number 065050, the entire City is in Zone D, for which no floodplain management regulations are required. In addition, according to the City's Dam Failure Inundation Map (Plate P-2, of the adopted 2002 Safety Element of the 40 North Daisy Ave Zone Change, Initial Study

City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area. The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact from exposing people or structures to flooding risks, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam.

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

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

WHY? The City of Pasadena is not located near enough to any inland bodies of water or the Pacific Ocean to be inundated by either a seiche or tsunami. For mudflow see responses to 9. Geology and Soils a. iii and iv regarding seismic hazards such as liquefaction and landslides.

12. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

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

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

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building. The project will not physically divide an existing community, as the site is surrounded by similar development on all sides, and is located within a highly urbanized area. No adverse impact will result.

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?* ()

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

WHY? The existing use on the subject site is consistent with the General Plan land-use designation, as shown in the 2004 adopted Land Use Element, but not with the zoning designation. The proposed zone change will remove this inconsistency, and will make it consistent with the zoning designation of the primary use (religious facility), which it is ancillary to. This zone change request does not involve any change, expansion or removal of the existing structure. The zone change will allow the structure and office use to remain and continue to serve as ancillary to the religious facility in the adjacent parcel. The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building.

The land use designation of the project site is Specific Plan, and the zoning designation is EPSP-d1-IG (East Pasadena Specific Plan, district 1, General Industrial). The site is currently developed with a one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building and is used as office ancillary to the church located at the adjacent parcel to the south and east of the project site (2801-2803 East Colorado Boulevard). The current zoning designation (EPSP-d1-IG) of the subject site has a General Industrial base zoning, which does not permit religious assembly use. An office ancillary to the religious facility use is not permitted either.

The adjacent parcels to the west, east and south are all within the ECSP-CG-5 zoning district, which has a General Commercial base, and which conditionally allows religious facilities and its ancillary uses, such as the office use ancillary to the church. The zone change request seeks to change the zoning designation of the office site from EPSP-d1-IG to that of the church site, ECSP-CG-5 to achieve a consistent zoning designation for both parcels.

The Land Use Element of the General Plan provides the following policies and objectives that are relevant to the proposed zone change:

Policy 13.1 – Support of organizations: Support the needs of the public, private and voluntary organizations and associations that provide important services to Pasadena’s diverse community.

Objective 24 – EXISTING INSTITUTIONS: Provide long-term opportunities for growth of existing cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions in balance with their surroundings.

Policy 24.2 – Land Use Opportunities: Provide land use opportunities to retain and to develop regionally significant cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational uses.

Policy 24.4 – Support Planning: Support Specific Plans, master plans, and other planning activities initiated by cultural, scientific, corporate, entertainment and educational institutions.

The project site is used as an office ancillary to the adjacent religious facility. The religious facility is operated by the church organization that serves the needs of Pasadena’s diverse residents and families. The proposed zone change will help the office use to remain in the site and continue to serve as an ancillary use to the religious facility in the adjacent property.

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

WHY? Currently, there are no adopted Habitat Conservation or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City of Pasadena. There are also no approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plans.

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? ()*

WHY? No active mining operations exist in the City of Pasadena. There are two areas in Pasadena that may contain mineral resources. These two areas are Eaton Wash, which, was formerly mined for sand and gravel, and Devils Gate Reservoir, which was formerly mined for cement concrete aggregate. The project is not near these areas.

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? ()*

WHY? The City’s 2004 General Plan Land Use Element does not identify any mineral recovery sites within the City. Furthermore, there are no mineral-resource recovery sites shown in the Hahamongna Watershed Park Master Plan; or the 1999 “Aggregate Resources in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area” map published by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. No active mining operations

exist in the City of Pasadena and mining is not currently allowed within any of the City's designated land uses. Therefore, the proposed project would not have significant impacts from the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also Section 13.a) of this document.

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

WHY? The existing office use is compatible with the religious facility use in the adjacent parcel project site because their respective levels of noise are within the "Clearly Acceptable" range. The project itself will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. The proposed zone change would not introduce any change in land use, nor increase the intensity of use of the existing office use ancillary to the adjacent religious facility. The zone change will not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

The project would also not expose persons to excessive noise. 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 2 of the City's Noise Element (2002) the project site lies between the 65 and 70 dBA noise contours. This level of noise is within the "Clearly Acceptable" range for the proposed land use, as shown in Figure 1 of the City's Noise Element (2002). Therefore, the project would not expose existing and future employees of the existing office to noise levels in excess of standards.

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

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

WHY? The project site is not located near any sources of groundborne noise or vibration.

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

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

WHY? See response to 14.a. The project will not lead to a significant permanent increase in ambient noise. The project does not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code.

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

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

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. The zone change will not involve installing a stationary noise source, and the only long-term noise generated by the project would be typical urban environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Chapter 9.36 of the Pasadena Municipal Code. Therefore, adhering to established City regulations will ensure that the project would not generate noise levels in excess of standards.

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? There are no airports or airport land-use plans in the City of Pasadena. The closest airport is the Bob Hope Airport (formerly the Burbank-Glendale-Pasadena Airport), which is located more than 10 miles from Pasadena in the City of Burbank. Therefore, the proposed zone change would not expose people to excessive airport related noise and would have no associated impacts.

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? There are no private-use airports or airstrips within or near the City of Pasadena.

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)? ()

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving as ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. The existing office use ancillary to a religious facility is not permitted in the zoning designation for the site (EPSP-d1-IG). The proposal is to change the zoning to ECSP-CG-5, which permits the office use ancillary to a religious facility. (See Section 12 of this document). However, the site is designated for General Industrial zoning, which is a more intensive land use than the existing office use, which the applicant intends to maintain as office use ancillary to the religious facility and school in the adjacent parcel. Therefore, the proposed zone change is consistent with the growth anticipated and accommodated by the City's General Plan. Furthermore, the project site is located in a developed urban area with an established roadway network and in-place infrastructure. The proposed zone change would not require extending or improving infrastructure in a manner that would facilitate off-site growth. Therefore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth, and would have no related impacts.

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

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

WHY? The project site does not contain any existing dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed zone change would not displace any residents or housing, and would have no related impacts.

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

WHY? No persons currently reside on the project site and the project site does not contain any existing dwelling units. Therefore, the proposed zone change would not displace any people, and would have no related impacts.

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? ()

WHY? The proposed zone change will not result in the need for additional new or altered fire protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed project consists of changing the current zoning designation EPSP-d1-IG, which does not permit the existing office use ancillary to a religious facility in the adjacent parcel, to ECSP-CG-5, which permits such use. The proposed zone change will make the office use consistent with the surrounding zoning district. Furthermore, any improvements, new development, or any change in use or intensification of use in the project site will be required to pay the City's development fees, which are established to offset incremental increases to fire service demand. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact fire protection services. The project site is not located in an area of moderate or very high fire hazard. The project site is surrounded by urban development and not adjacent to any wild lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not adversely affect the provision of fire protection at an acceptable service level.

b. Libraries? ()

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. The project site is located approximately less than half a mile from the nearest branch library located at Lamanda Park, 140 South Altadena Boulevard. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project would have no impact on library services.

c. Parks? ()

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development or new construction is associated with the proposed zone change. The City collects an impact fee of \$3.09 per square foot of non-residential space in new construction projects that mitigates any impact on parks. No fees will be collected because there will be no new construction. Nevertheless, the project will not have any impact on parks. The project site is located approximately within half a mile of the nearest park, Eaton Blanche Park located 3100 East Del Mar Boulevard.

d. Police Protection? ()

WHY? The proposed zone change will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times. The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. Therefore, the project would have no impact on police protection services.

e. Schools? ()

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. Should there be any future new construction in the project site, the City collects a school impact fee for non-residential development. Payment of this fee mitigates any impact on school services.

f. Other public facilities? ()

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. Any future new construction in the project site may result in additional maintenance of public facilities. However, with the projected revenue to the City in terms of impact fees, increased property taxes and development fees, this impact would not be 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?* ()

WHY? The proposed zone change is for a non-residential project that would not directly increase the City's population. The project site contains an office building serving as an office ancillary to the adjacent religious facility. There is a potential for an increase in usage of park space given the new employees and patrons associated with any future new construction or intensification of use in the project site. The City collects a park impact fee for non-residential projects. These fees are used to fund the City's park maintenance and improvement program. The project itself would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related impacts.

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 proposed zone change does not include recreational facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project does not involve the development of recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts.

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 proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. The City of Pasadena Department of Transportation reviewed the proposed zone change and determined that no additional traffic analysis is required. This decision is in part based on the fact that the existing street system has sufficient capacity to serve the proposed project. Therefore, the project will not impact the traffic load and capacity of the street system.

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 Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) adopted their most recent Congestion Management Program (CMP) in 2004. This CMP identifies level of service (LOS) E or better as acceptable for the designated CMP highway and road system. The CMP further states, "a significant 40 North Daisy Ave Zone Change, Initial Study 9/25/06 Page 25 of 31

impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2% of capacity (V/C [volume to capacity ratio] = 0.02), causing LOS F (V/C > 1.00). If the facility is already at LOS F, a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2% of capacity (V/C = 0.02)."

The proposed zone change would not add 50 or more trips during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to any CMP facility, and would not add 150 or more trips, in either direction, during either the AM or PM weekday peak hours to a mainline freeway. Thus, due to the size of the project, an impact analysis for CMP facilities is not required for the proposed project. In addition, according to PasDOT, the project would not impact the level of service (LOS) at any roadway intersections. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, an established level of service standard, and would have no related impacts.

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. Consequently, the proposed project would not affect any airport facilities and would not cause a change in the directional patterns of aircraft. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to air traffic patterns.

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 PasDOT and its impact on circulation due to the proposed zone change. Because the zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office use ancillary to the adjacent religious facility, the project has been found not to be hazardous to traffic circulation either within the project or in the vicinity of the project. In addition, the project's circulation design meets the City's engineering standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use, and would have no associated impacts.

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

WHY? The ingress and egress for the site have been evaluated by the PasDOT and found to be adequate for emergency access or access to nearby uses. The proposed zone change does not involve the elimination of a through-route, does not involve the narrowing of a roadway, and all proposed roadways, access roads and drive lanes meet the Pasadena Fire Department's access standards. Therefore, there will be no impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

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

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. The zone change would neither increase the demand for parking nor eliminate any existing parking spaces. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to parking.

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

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. The zone change would not affect any of the adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. The existing 5,222-square foot office use generates approximately 1044 gallons per day of wastewater in the form of domestic sewage. Domestic sewage typically meets wastewater treatment requirements because wastewater treatment facilities are designed to treat domestic sewage. The project does not involve the release of unique or unusual sewage into the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have no associated impacts.

- 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 proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change, and would not increase the demand for water and wastewater service. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, and the project would have no associated impacts. The City's Water and Power Department is responsible for water and water treatment facilities.

- 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 proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change. The project will not require the construction of new storm water 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. As discussed in Section 11, the project does not involve changes in the site's drainage patterns and does not involve altering any drainage courses or flood control channels.

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

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. No new development is associated with the proposed zone change, and would not increase the demand for water. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient water supplies, and would cause no related impacts.

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? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. There is no new development associated with the proposed zone change, and would not increase the demand for wastewater service. Therefore, the project would not result in insufficient wastewater service, and would cause no related impacts.

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

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. There is no new development associated with the proposed zone change.

The project site is located in a developed urban area and is 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. Therefore, the project would cause no impacts under this topic

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

WHY? The proposed zone change does not involve any change in the existing one-story, 5,222-square-foot office building serving an ancillary use to the adjacent religious facility. There is no new development

associated with the proposed zone change. Therefore, the project would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

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).

- a) Earlier Analysis Used. No program EIR, tiering, or other process was used for analysis of the proposed zone change's environmental effects.
- b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. This Initial Study finds that the proposed zone change will not have any potential impact on the environment.
- c) Mitigation Measures. Because the proposed zone change will not have any potential impact on the environment, no mitigation measures are required.

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? ()*

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

WHY? As discussed in Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed zone change would not have substantial impacts to Aesthetic or Air Quality. Also, as discussed in Section 6 and 11 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to special status species, stream habitat, and wildlife dispersal and migration. Furthermore, the proposed project would not affect the local, regional, or national populations or ranges of any plant or animal species and would not threaten any plant communities. Similarly, as discussed in Section 7 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources, and thus, would not eliminate any important examples of California history or prehistory. As discussed in Sections 11, 13 and 14 of this document, the proposed project would not have substantial impacts to water quality, Mineral Resources or Noise.

Therefore, the project will not substantially degrade the quality of the land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, noise and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.

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? ()*

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

WHY? The proposed zone change would not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The proposed zone change does not include any improvements on the project site. As such, and as described throughout this Initial Study, the project would have no environmental impacts that could contribute to cumulative impacts. Therefore, the proposed project does not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to cumulative impacts.

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

WHY? As discussed in Sections 5, 10, 11, and 18 of this document, the proposed project would not expose persons to the hazards of toxic air emissions, chemical or explosive materials, flooding, or transportation hazards. Section 9 of this document explains that although residents of the proposed would be exposed to typical southern California earthquake hazards, modern engineering practices would ensure that geologic and seismic conditions would not directly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. In addition, as discussed in Sections 3 Aesthetics, 12 Land Use and Planning, 14 Noise, 15 Population and Housing, 16 Public Services, 17 Recreation, 18 Transportation/Traffic and 19 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

Therefore, the proposed project would not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

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 | CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993 |
| 3 | East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001 |
| 4 | Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983 |
| 5 | Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002 |
| 6 | Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, Zoning Code Revisions, and Central District Specific Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 2004 |
| 7 | 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002. |
| 8 | Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868 |
| 9 | Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004 |
| 10 | Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004 |
| 11 | Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002 |
| 12 | Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854 |
| 13 | North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997 |
| 14 | Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended |
| 15 | Recommendations On Siting New Sensitive Land Uses, California Air Resources Board, May 2005 |
| 16 | Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994 |
| 17 | Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002 |
| 18 | Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975 |
| 19 | 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. |
| 20 | South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998 |
| 21 | 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 |
| 22 | Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837 |
| 23 | Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines, City of Pasadena, August, 2005 |
| 24 | Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896 |
| 25 | West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001 |
| 26 | Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code |



City of Pasadena
Planning Division
175 N. Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, California 91101-1704

PROPOSED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT TITLE: Zone Change from Industrial to Commercial

PROJECT APPLICANT: Curtis Ro, Atelier Development Company for
Light of Love Mission Church

PROJECT CONTACT PERSON: Annabella Atendido,

ADDRESS: City of Pasadena, Planning Division
175 North Garfield Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101-1704

TELEPHONE: (626)744-6707

PROJECT LOCATION: 40 North Daisy Avenue, southeast corner of the Daisy
Avenue/Nina Street intersection, City of Pasadena, County of
Los Angeles, State of California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is a request for a Zone Change for a parcel located at the southeast corner of Daisy Avenue and Nina Street, from EPSP-d1-IG (East Pasadena Specific Plan, district 1, General Industrial) to ECSP-CG-5 (East Colorado Specific Plan, General Commercial, area 5, Lamanda Area). There is no proposal to change the existing one-story, 5222-square foot office building, nor construct any new structure in the subject site.

The existing office building is an ancillary use to the religious facility located at the adjacent parcel to the south and east (2801-2803 East Colorado Boulevard) of the subject site. The current zoning designation (EPSP-d1-IG) of the subject site has a General Industrial base zoning, which does not permit religious assembly use and its ancillary uses. The adjacent parcels to the west, east and south are all within the ECSP-CG-5 zoning district, which has a General Commercial base, and which conditionally allows religious facilities use and its ancillary uses, such as the office use ancillary to the church.

FINDING

On the basis of the initial study on file in the Community Planning Office:

The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment.

The proposed project COULD have a significant effect on the environment, however there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in the Mitigation Monitoring Program on file in the Planning Division Office were adopted to reduce the potential impacts to a level of insignificance.

The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Completed by: Annabella Atendido	Determination Approved: Jennifer Paige-Saeki
Title: Planner	Title: Senior Planner, Environmental
Date: October 4, 2006	Date: October

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: November 16 – December 13, 2006

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT: Yes No

INITIAL STUDY REVISED: Yes No