

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.

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 amendments will not have an effect on storm water drainage, and will not result in the need for new or substantial alteration to the existing drainage system. According to the Specific Plan Final EIR, the Specific Plan area in which the amendments are proposed, the Specific Plan area is located in a developed urban area where storm drainage is provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins.

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

**WHY?** The project will not by itself degrade water quality. For future projects, runoff will be controlled during construction using required Best Management Practices. There are no known hazardous materials that would be disturbed during construction. Future projects will most likely connect to the existing water, sewer and storm drain systems. The environmental review of future projects proposed under the new zoning and land use designations will assess any impacts on groundwater 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?* ( )

**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.

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

**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. 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? ( )*

**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 City's General Plan) the project is not located in a dam inundation area. 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? ( )*

**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? ( )*

**WHY?** The project will not physically divide an existing community, as the site is surrounded by similar development on all sides, and the project would redefine certain design and use parameters for infill development 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? ( )*

**WHY?** The project calls for some reductions in density and an increase in density in one area, in addition to maintaining densities within the Specific Plan area. These densities are within the ranges allowed by the General Plan Land Use Diagram and the Zoning Code. Notwithstanding the proposed density reductions and increase, the 500 unit General Plan allocation remains the same. The proposed building heights, and land use modifications are consistent with Zoning Code regulations. The project itself is consistent with the General Plan policy of targeting development within Specific Plan areas.

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? ( )

**WHY?** The proposed amendments will not lead to a significant increase in ambient noise. The Specific Plan Final EIR further states that noise generated by any future 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. Any future project will adhere to City regulations governing hours of construction and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment and the allowed level of ambient noise according to the Pasadena Municipal Code.

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

**WHY?** The project 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?* ( )

**WHY?** See response to 14.a. The Noise Restrictions Ordinance (Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 ) sets the allowed ambient noise level. The project does not involve construction and 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?** See responses 14.a and c. The project will not cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels.

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 project 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 project is in a developed area where all the major infrastructure is in place. According to the North Lake Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, dated November 1996, the entire North Lake Avenue Specific Plan will result in the potential net gain of 1,210 persons in residential population with 500 units allocated for the Specific Plan area by the 1994 General Plan Land Use Element. This gain was not considered significant because the North Lake Avenue Specific Plan conforms with the existing General Plan and zoning land-use designations. The proposed specific plan amendments would not change the growth allocated for the North Lake Avenue Specific Plan area but, rather, would redistribute the growth within the specific plan area. The proposed amendment revisions to land use recommendations to allow residential only in one segment (removes commercial and mixed use), and add mixed-use in addition to commercial uses in another segment, were previously allowed by the Specific Plan and analyzed by the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed amendments to the North Lake Avenue Specific Plan would not induce population growth and would not cause related environmental impacts.

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

**WHY?** The project does not involve the demolition of housing units. This growth allocation of the North Lake Specific Plan, which would not change with the proposed amendments, conforms to the 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002, therefore this housing gain is within the housing forecast in this element. It is also within the range of housing forecast for Pasadena contained in the Southern California 2020 - a preliminary Growth Forecast: Regional Overview prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments.

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

**WHY?** The proposed project 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 project 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 Specific Plan Final EIR further states that the Specific Plan area in which the amendments are proposed, is located in a low fire hazard area according to the Fire and Flooding Map of the Seismic and Safety Element of the 1994 General Plan. There is a Fire Station within the boundaries of the Specific Plan on Lake immediately north of Orange Grove Boulevard. Any future development proposed under the Specific Plan is subject to review by the Fire Department and the Building Official.

b. Libraries? ( )

**WHY?** There is a Library within the boundaries of the Specific Plan area. The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project would not significantly impact library services.

c. Parks? ( )

**WHY?** A Neighborhood Park, Washington Park is within the boundaries of the Specific Plan area. According to the City's park impact fee nexus study prepared in 2004, for every 1000 residents the City as a whole has 2.17 acres of developed parkland and 1.49 acres of open space parkland, for a total of 3.66 acres of park and open space per 1000 residents. The proposed density, height, and land use modifications will not affect the provision of park and recreational service.

For each new residential unit there is a "Residential Impact Fee" charged under the Quimby Act. On December 6, 2004, the City modified their Quimby Act ordinance (Ordinance #6252) to increase the park mitigation fees. Under the first year of the modified ordinance, the park mitigation fee will be \$10,977 per residential unit; after December 6, 2005 the park mitigation fee will be \$19,743 per residential unit. Payment of this fee mitigates any project impact on parks. The City collects an impact fee of \$3.09 per square foot of non-residential space. Payment of this fee mitigates any impact on parks.

d. Police Protection? ( )

**WHY?** The proposed project will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services and will not alter acceptable service ratios or response times.

d. Schools? ( )

**WHY?** The proposed amendments will not affect the provision of educational services. 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.

e. Other public facilities? ( )

**WHY?** The proposed amendments will not affect the provision of other public facilities.

**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?* ( )

The Specific Plan EIR states that recreational opportunities in the vicinity have already been established and that the Specific Plan will not impact their quality or quantity. The existing neighborhood park, Washington Park located within the boundaries of the Specific Plan may be utilized by new residents or employees (generated by the Specific Plan allocation). The EIR further states that Washington Park can absorb this potential increase in use. Although the proposed project includes an increase in density, it represents a shift in new housing units not an increase in the Specific Plan allocation. Therefore, the project itself would not lead to substantial physical deterioration of any recreational facilities, and would have no related significant impacts. 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.

- 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 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?** According to the Specific Plan Final EIR, the Traffic Impact Analysis included in the EIR was prepared based on the General Plan allocation of 500 new housing units and 175,000 square feet of non-residential square footage. The Traffic Study conclusions state that "with implementation of the measures described in the Mitigation section, all transportation impacts are expected to be mitigated." The proposed amendments will not change the status quo. Further, the 2004 Mobility Element incorporates these Specific Plan EIR mitigation measures. Further, staff in consultation with the Transportation Department discussed the potential impact of the 375 units as a result of a proposed increase in density for the segment along Lake Avenue, between Orange Grove Boulevard and Maple Street. The 2004 adopted General Plan did analyze the Specific Plan area's density allocation of 500 units, and stated that the City's street system has adequate capacity to accommodate anticipated growth citywide. The 2004 Mobility Element cites a number of transportation improvements that are needed to accommodate anticipated growth citywide. One of these improvements includes street widening for Maple Street between North Lake Avenue and Los Robles Avenue. Consistent with the goals and objectives for the North Lake Specific Plan, new projects along North Lake Avenue are within the Enterprise Zone Business Development Area (EZBDA) and will be waived for paying the newly adopted Traffic Reduction and Transportation Improvement Fee. Each proposed project, however, is subject to site specific traffic impact review and will be responsible for mitigating its impacts which is similar to new developments occurring in other Specific Plan areas. These project-

specific reviews will be managed by the Department of Transportation in accordance with the City's established guidelines and traffic impact thresholds. The Mobility Element cites a number of transportation improvements to be initiated through the City's Capital Improvement Program, including North Lake Avenue improvements that are needed to accommodate anticipated growth citywide.

~~Since the proposed amendments to the North Lake Avenue Specific Plan would not increase the specific plan area's growth allocation, the proposed project would not cause an increase in the amount of vehicle trips to or from the specific plan area. The project does involve the redistribution of land use densities within the specific plan area, which could lead to the localized redistribution of vehicle trips. This redistribution of trips could increase traffic at the intersections adjacent to parcels proposed for increased density—specifically, Lake Avenue between Maple and Orange Grove. However, the proposed allowable density increase in this area, 32 du per acre to 48 du per acre, is too minimal to result in a noticeable change in the traffic capacity of any surrounding roadways or intersections. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a significant impact related to 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 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)."

In addition to CMP thresholds, the City's "Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines" August, 2005 states that the following changes in LOS due to a project are considered a significant traffic impact:

Intersection Capacity Analysis (ICU)	
Current ICU	Change due to project
A	0.060
B	0.050
C	0.040
D	0.030
E	0.020
F	0.010

As discussed above in Section 18(b), the proposed specific plan amendments would not increase the specific plan area's growth allocation, the proposed project would not cause an increase in the amount of vehicle trips to or from the specific plan area. As such, the proposed project would result in the addition of 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 proposed specific plan amendments would not significantly impact the level of service (LOS) at any roadway intersections. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, an establish level of service standard, and would have no related significant 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?** A proposed change in density, height, or land use will not increase hazards or incompatible uses.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access? ( )

**WHY?** The ingress and egress for the sites within the project area will not change due to the proposed amendments to include density, height, and land use modifications.

b. Result in inadequate parking capacity? ( )

**WHY?** According to the Specific Plan EIR, it states that due to the increased intensity of land use, the project will increase the demand for parking. However, future projects would be required to comply with the number of parking and loading spaces required by the Zoning Code. The proposed amendments would not change these requirements.

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

**WHY?** Objective 3.2.2 of the City's 2004 Mobility Element is to "Encourage Non-Auto Travel, a major goal of the Specific Plan is "Move away from Auto Oriented Uses", and one of the seven Guiding Principles of the General Plan Land Use Element states that Pasadena will be a City where people can circulate without cars". The concepts developed in the Specific Plan were developed around these goals. Both the Mobility Element and Specific Plan are implementation tools of the General Plan. Therefore the proposed amendments are not in conflict with adopted City policies, plans, and programs.

**19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.** Would the project:

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

**WHY?** The Implementation of the proposed amendments, which include changes to density, height, and land uses will not require or result in the construction of new, or expansion of existing water or wastewater treatment facilities. However, any individual project built after the amendments would be in place will need to prepare its own environmental analysis. Furthermore, the Specific Plan Final EIR reviewed the affects of the Specific Plan allocation of new housing units and stated that regulations are in place to ensure that wastewater treatment requirements are not exceeded.

- 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** See 19.a.

- 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 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. Any future projects would be infill in nature and would therefore be accessible to existing infrastructure.

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

**WHY?**

- 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 response to 19.a.

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

**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 is permitted through 2025, 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. 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?** In 1992, the City adopted the "Source Reduction and Recycling Element" to comply with the California Integrated Waste Management Act. This Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50% or better diversion rate for solid waste. The City implements this requirement through Section 8.61 of the Pasadena Municipal Code, which establishes the City's "Solid Waste Collection Franchise System". As described in Section 8.61.175, each franchisee is responsible for meeting the minimum recycling diversion rate of 50% on both a monthly basis and annual basis. Future projects are required to comply with the applicable solid waste franchise's recycling system, and thus, will meet Pasadena's and California's solid waste diversion regulations. 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. A copy of the Final Land Use and Mobility Element EIR, 1994 Final General Plan EIR, and Final EIR for the North Lake Specific Plan is available for review at the Permit Center, 175 North Garfield Avenue between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Monday through Thursday and from 8:00-12:00 p.m. every Friday and the City Clerk's Office Monday through Thursday from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and every other Friday during the same hours. Interested parties may call this office at (626) 744 – 4009.
- b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. The affects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in the Final EIR for the North Lake Specific Plan, in conjunction with the Final Land Use and Mobility Element EIR and 1994 Final General Plan EIR, pursuant to applicable legal standards, any effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis stated in the Final EIR for the North Lake Specific Plan.
- c) Mitigation Measures. See Final EIR for the North Lake Specific Plan.

**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 Sections 3 and 5 of this document, the proposed project 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? ( )*

**WHY?** The proposed project would not cause impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The project has the potential to contribute to cumulative [air quality, biological resource, hydrology, water quality, noise, population, housing, public services, recreation, traffic, and utility impacts, etc.] impacts. However, none of these cumulative impacts are substantial, and the project would not cause any cumulative impacts to become substantial. 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 #6863   |
| 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   |

**TO:** City Council

**DATE:** June 25, 2007

**FROM:** DIRECTOR OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

**SUBJECT:** INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY ERRATA FOR ADDITIONAL  
NORTH LAKE SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENTS

---

**Background:**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), allows for the preparation of an errata sheet to address revisions to the Draft Initial Environmental Study. As a result of the revised recommendations for two of the North Lake Specific Plan amendments, the project description and appropriate sections have been revised accordingly. Any additional text is underlined, and text to be replaced by new text is shown with a strikethrough. In addition to the project description, the Population and Housing section has been revised. The Transportation/Traffic section was revised to address the Planning Commission's direction at the January 24, 2007 meeting, to include the potential impact of 375 units proposed for the Orange Grove Boulevard to Maple Street segment. With these proposed changes to the Draft Initial Environmental Study, staff concludes that there are no new impacts pertaining to the revised amendments that would require further analysis, recirculation and documentation. As indicated in the staff recommendation, the Negative Declaration would need to be adopted with Initial Study and accompanying Errata Sheet. The following represent the respective sections of the Initial Study that have text changes:

**8. Description of the Project:**

As part of the Specific Plan Five Year Review process, this is the first series of amendments that are proposed which involve potential changes to density of residential and mixed-use development, zoning designations, an increase in maximum permitted building height in certain portions of the Specific Plan area, and land use modifications. There is no new construction proposed as part of this action; and the proposed amendments would not change the Specific Plan's General Plan allocation of 500 residential units and 175,000 square feet of non-residential square footage. The proposed changes are as follows (see attached map), with affected portions identified by the respective street names:

**Segment 3**

**North Lake Avenue – Mountain Street to Orange Grove Boulevard.**

Existing Zoning – CL SP1A (Commercial Limited, Specific Plan Village Building Type) – Allows 32 units per acre.

Proposed land use modification- ~~No new~~

~~residential development should be allowed to protect the commercial character of this segment of the corridor. Maintain commercial (CL SP 1A) and allow mixed-use. Maintain height for commercial development at 30, and a maximum of 36 feet for mixed-use. Change the zoning designation for the three parcels located at the northwest corner of Mentor Avenue and Orange Grove Boulevard from commercial (CL) to Multi-family residential (RM-16).~~

### **Segment 5**

**North Lake Avenue (West of Lake, North side only) El Molino to Palm Terrace (No change Previously recommended in this segment)**

Existing Zoning – CL SP1A (Commercial Limited, Specific Plan Village Building Type) – Allows 32 units per acre.

Proposed land use modification – Allow residential only, along the north side, prohibit commercial, mixed use, and work-live. This would constitute a zone change from CL to RM 32 (Multi-family residential, 32 units per acre). Eliminate proposed height of 25 feet for commercial and 37 feet for mixed-use.

### **Segment 6**

**Washington (East of Lake, south side only) Mentor - Catalina**

Existing Zoning – CO SP-1A (Commercial Office, Specific Plan House Building Type – Allows 32 units per acre. Proposed land use modification – ~~Reduce Density from 48 to 32 units per acre.~~ Proposed Density – reduce density from 48 to 16 units. Maintain north side at 32 units per acre, allow commercial, residential, mixed-use and work-live. Reduce height for residential development from 38 to 36 feet. On south side, allow residential uses only (no commercial, mixed-use, or work-live. Reduce height for residential development from 38 to 36 feet.

**Under Land Use Modifications**, the Drive-through land use will be modified as a result of these proposed amendments. In segment 3, Mountain Street to Orange Grove Boulevard, existing Drive-through uses would be exempt from the Nonconforming provisions of Chapter 17.71 of the Zoning

Code, and therefore would be allowed to retain drive-through service for any expansion or remodel, and would be allowed to increase queuing positions or service windows. A Conditional Use Permit would continue to be required under the Nonconforming provisions.

**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 project is in a developed area where all the major infrastructure is in place. According to the North Lake Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, dated November 1996, the entire North Lake Avenue Specific Plan will result in the potential net gain of 1,210 persons in residential population with 500 units allocated for the Specific Plan area by the 1994 General Plan Land Use Element. This gain was not considered significant because the North Lake Avenue Specific Plan conforms with the existing General Plan and zoning land-use designations. The proposed specific plan amendments would not change the growth allocated for the North Lake Avenue Specific Plan area but, rather, would redistribute the growth within the specific plan area. The recommended amendment revisions to land use recommendations to allow residential only in one segment (removes commercial and mixed use), and add mixed-use in addition to commercial uses in another segment, were previously allowed by the Specific Plan and analyzed by the Specific Plan EIR. Therefore, the proposed amendments to the North Lake Avenue Specific Plan would not induce population growth and would cause no related environmental 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?** According to the Specific Plan Final EIR, the Traffic Impact Analysis included in the EIR was prepared based on the General Plan allocation of 500 new housing units and 175,000 square feet of non-residential square footage.



The Traffic Study conclusions state that “with implementation of the measures described in the Mitigation section, all transportation impacts are expected to be mitigated.” The proposed amendments will not change the status quo. Further, the 2004 Mobility Element incorporates these Specific Plan EIR mitigation measures. Further, staff in consultation with the Transportation Department discussed the potential impact of the 375 units as a result of a proposed increase in density for the segment along Lake Avenue, between Orange Grove Boulevard and Maple Street. The 2004 adopted General Plan did analyze the Specific Plan area’s density allocation of 500 units, and stated that the City’s street system has adequate capacity to accommodate anticipated growth citywide. The 2004 Mobility Element cites a number of transportation improvements that are needed to accommodate anticipated growth citywide. One of these improvements includes street widening for Maple Street between North Lake Avenue and Los Robles Avenue. Consistent with the goals and objectives for the North Lake Specific Plan, new projects along North Lake Avenue are within the Enterprise Zone Business Development Area (EZBDA) will be waived from paying the newly adopted Traffic Reduction and Transportation Improvement Fee. Each proposed project, however, is subject to site specific traffic impact review and will be responsible for mitigating its impacts which is similar to new developments occurring in other Specific Plan areas. These project- specific reviews will be managed by the Department of Transportation in accordance with the City’s established guidelines and traffic impact thresholds. The Mobility Element cites a number of transportation improvements to be initiated through the City’s Capital Improvement Program, including North Lake Avenue improvements that are needed to accommodate anticipated growth citywide.

~~Since the proposed amendments to the North Lake Avenue Specific Plan would not increase the specific plan area’s growth allocation, the proposed project would not cause an increase in the amount of vehicle trips to or from the specific plan area. The project does involve the redistribution of land use densities within the specific plan area, which could lead to the localized redistribution of vehicle trips. This redistribution of trips could increase traffic at the intersections adjacent to parcels proposed for increased density — specifically, Lake Avenue between Maple and Orange Grove. However, the proposed allowable density increase in this area, 32 du per acre to 48 du per acre, is too minimal to result in a noticeable change in the traffic capacity of any surrounding roadways or intersections. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a significant impact related to the traffic load and capacity of the street system.~~



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

## NEGATIVE DECLARATION

---

PROJECT TITLE: North Lake Specific Plan Amendments

PROJECT APPLICANT: City of Pasadena

PROJECT CONTACT PERSON: Patrice A. Martin

ADDRESS: 175 No. Garfield Avenue

TELEPHONE: (626) 744 - 3758

PROJECT LOCATION: North Lake Specific Plan  
City of Pasadena  
County of Los Angeles  
State of California

---

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: As part of the North Lake Specific Plan Five Year Review process, this is the first series of amendments that are proposed which involve potential changes to density of residential and mixed use development, building height in certain portions of the Specific Plan area, and certain land use modifications. There is no new construction proposed as part of this action; and the proposed amendments would not change the General Plan's allocation for the Specific Plan of 500 residential units and 175,000 square feet of non-residential square footage.

---

### FINDING

On the basis of the initial study on file in the Current 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: Patrice A. Martin  
Title: Senior Planner  
Date: 12/7/06

Determination Approved:   
Title: *Sr. Planner*  
Date: *12/7/06*

---

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD:  
COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT: \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No  
INITIAL STUDY REVISED: \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

nd-mnd.doc