

ATTACHMENT F

CITY OF PASADENA
175 NORTH GARFIELD AVENUE
PASADENA, CA 91101-1704

**ADDENDUM TO THE LOWER HASTINGS RANCH DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS
INITIAL STUDY**

In accordance with the Environmental Policy Guidelines of the City of Pasadena, and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15164, this analysis serves as an Addendum to the previously adopted City of Pasadena Lower Hastings Ranch Development Standards Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND). The Lower Hastings Ranch Development Standards IS/ND was adopted on March 14, 2011. The environmental analysis provided in Section II of this Addendum provides substantial evidence to support that none of the circumstances set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 would result from adoption and implementation of the revised project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and the Addendums consistency with these guidelines are addressed below.

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Mansionization and Neighborhood Compatibility Zoning Code Revision Amendment (Zoning Code Section 17.28.090)
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Martin Potter, Associate Planner
(661) 744-6710
4. Project Location:

The Lower Hastings Ranch Neighborhood is located in East Pasadena, south of Sierra Madre Boulevard, north of Sears Way, west of the City's easternmost boundary, and east of Rosemead Boulevard. The neighborhood consists of approximately 600 residential properties, developed primarily between the late 1940s and early 1950s. Many of the homes were originally designed with Ranch Style architectural features.

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of Pasadena
6. General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential
7. Zoning: RS-6 ND (Single-Family Residential, Neighborhood Overlay District)
8. Description of the Project:

The Neighborhood Overlay District was adopted in 1991 to create special development standards for single-family additions in Lower Hastings Ranch. The City of Pasadena is preparing amendments to the City's Zoning Code to update the Neighborhood Overlay District and create additional development standards for new single-family houses and residential additions within Lower Hastings Ranch. The code amendments are intended to ensure that new single-family houses and residential additions are compatible and appropriate with existing development.

The existing Neighborhood District provides development standards for new two-story houses and second-story additions in the Lower Hastings Ranch area. The standards regulate second-story front and side setbacks, building heights and the development of front porches. Table 1 shows the changes in the development standards that would occur with implementation of the Neighborhood Overlay District amendment.

**Table 1
Changes in Zoning Requirements**

	Existing	Proposed
Floor Area Ratio	Sites less than 12,000 square feet – 30% of lot size plus 500 square feet Sites 12,000 square feet to 24,000 square feet – 20% of lot size plus 500 square feet Sites over 24,000 square feet – 25% of lot size plus 500 square feet	Same; however any portion of a lot with 50% slope or greater shall be deducted when calculating gross floor area.
Second Story Floor Area	Second stories are limited to 50% of the floor area of the first story, including attached garages	Attached garages no longer counted in floor area calculation
Height Limits	Maximum height to top of roof – 26 feet Maximum height to top plate – 20 feet Maximum height to top plate for first floor – 10 feet	No change
Roof Pitch	Maximum 4:12 pitch	No change
Side Yard Encroachment Plane	A 45-degree angle, measured six feet up from the side property line	No change
Front Porches and Entryways	No more than 10 feet high, or height of the existing top plate	No change
Second Story Setbacks	10 additional feet from first-story front wall 5 additional feet from first-story side walls	In addition to existing requirements, a new 5 foot setback from the first-story rear walls.
Ranch-Style Architecture	None	Require all new houses and exterior remodels to be consistent with ranch-style architecture
View Protection	None	Require houses to be designed and located to avoid blocking neighbors' views
Privacy	None	Require windows, porches, and decks to be designed and oriented with consideration of neighbors' privacy Projecting balconies, decks, and porches on the second floor are prohibited
Roof Design	None	Require appropriate roof designs, including hipped, dutch-gabled, side-gabled, and cross-gabled First-story roof eaves must be continuous to avoid a flat, two story tall wall.
Appropriate Materials	None	Require appropriate roof and wall materials including asphalt shingles, wood shingles, flat tiles, brick, stucco, board-and-batten, stone.
Appropriate Windows	None	Require appropriate window types, including double-hung, casement, clerestory, and picture windows. Two-story tall windows are prohibited
Prohibited Design Elements	None	Prohibit elements such as faux columns, architectural foam, arched windows, quoins, ornate metal fences and railings.
Neighborhood Development Permit	None	Discretionary permit required for new houses (whether one or two-story), additions to existing two-story houses, or additions visible from the public right of way.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

To the north of the neighborhood are Public/Semi-Public land uses such as churches, Field Elementary School, and La Salle Catholic High School. To the east are single-family residences within the City of Sierra Madre. To the south and southeast are shopping centers with general commercial land uses.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

This Addendum covers all approvals by governmental agencies that may be needed to implement or operate this project. At this time, no discretionary public agency approvals are known to be required for the project, other than those by the City of Pasadena.

11. CEQA Standards for an Addendum

In accordance with CEQA if changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after certification of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (or adoption of a Negative Declaration), the Lead Agency shall determine whether to prepare a Subsequent EIR (or Negative Declaration), and Addendum to the EIR (or negative declaration), or no further documentation (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(b)).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 specifies the type of documentation required when changes are proposed to a project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 states:

- (a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:
 - (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
 - (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
 - (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;

- (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.
- (b) If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation.
 - (c) Once a project has been approved, the lead agency's role in project approval is completed, unless further discretionary approval on that project is required. Information appearing after an approval does not require reopening of that approval. If after the project is approved, any of the conditions described in subdivision (a) occurs, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall only be prepared by the public agency which grants the next discretionary approval for the project, if any. In this situation no other responsible agency shall grant an approval for the project until the subsequent EIR has been certified or subsequent negative declaration adopted.
 - (d) A subsequent EIR or subsequent negative declaration shall be given the same notice and public review as required under Section 15087 or Section 15072. A subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall state where the previous document is available and can be reviewed.

Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines includes situations when a subsequent or supplemental EIR is not required and an addendum is appropriate. CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 states:

- (a) The lead agency or responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.
- (b) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.
- (c) An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.
- (d) The decision making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.
- (e) A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

If the factors listed in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 or 15164 have not occurred or are not met, no changes to the previously certified EIR or previously adopted ND are necessary.

SUBJECT AREAS DETERMINED TO HAVE NEW SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OR SUBSTANTIALLY MORE SEVERE SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS COMPARED TO THOSE IDENTIFIED IN THE PREVIOUS ND OR EIR.:

The subject areas checked below were determined to be new significant environmental effects or to be previously identified effects that have a substantial increase in severity either due to a change in project, change in circumstances or new information of substantial importance, as indicated by the checklist and discussion on the following pages.

	Aesthetics		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Population/Housing
	Agricultural and Forestry Resources		Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Public Services
	Air Quality		Hydrology/Water Quality		Recreation
	Biological Resources		Land Use/Planning		Transportation/Traffic
	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities/Service Systems
	Geology and Soils		Noise		Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation no substantial changes are proposed in the project and there are no substantial changes in the circumstances under which the project will be undertaken that will require major revisions to the previous ND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Also, there is no "new information of substantial importance" as that term is used in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3). Therefore, the previously adopted ND is adequate without modification.

Prepared By _____ Date _____ Reviewed By _____ Date _____

Martin Potter
Printed Name

Printed Name

Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on: _____
Date

Adoption attested to by: _____
Signature

Printed name

Date

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

SECTION II - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted:
Department requiring checklist:
Case Manager:

2. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS. (explanations of all answers are required):

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

3. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

a. *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?* ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments include changes that will reduce the second story building envelope and provide greater discretionary review over any proposed second story construction within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. There are no proposed changes that will result in adverse impacts to views of the San Gabriel Mountains, the Arroyo Seco, the San Rafael Hills, Eaton Canyon, or any other scenic vista. In addition, the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood is located in East Pasadena and not near any scenic vistas; therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts related to scenic vistas.

b. *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?* ()

WHY? The only designated state scenic highway in the City of Pasadena is the Angeles Crest Highway (State Highway 2), which is located north of Arroyo Seco Canyon in the extreme northwest portion of the City. The Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood is not located within the vicinity of Angeles Crest Highway. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts related to state scenic highways or scenic roadway corridors.

c. *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?* ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments will further limit the mass and floor area permitted for new two-story homes and second story additions and are designed to encourage greater neighborhood compatibility by regulating architectural design for consistency with the prevailing architectural character of Lower Hastings Ranch and, recognizing that many homes in Lower Hastings Ranch are one-story, providing for a discretionary process for two-story construction. There are no proposed changes that will permanently degrade the quality of

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

development. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts related to degradation of existing visual character and quality.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? ()

WHY? Outdoor lighting for residential uses are regulated through Section 17.40.080 of the City's Municipal Code, such that lighting shall be shielded or recessed so that direct glare and reflections are confined to the maximum extent feasible within the boundaries of the site, and shall be directed downward and away from adjoining properties and public rights-of-way. No lighting on private property shall produce an illumination level greater than one footcandle on any property within a residential zoning district except on the site of the light source. All new development that would occur under the amendment to the Neighborhood Overlay District would be required to comply with Section 17.40.080, and new or substantially more severe significant impacts related light and glare would not occur.

4. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project.

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? ()

WHY? The City of Pasadena is a developed urban area surrounded by hillsides to the north and northwest. The western portion of the City contains the Arroyo Seco, which runs from north to south through the City. It has commercial recreation, park, natural and open space. The City contains no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance, as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency and new or substantially more severe significant impacts related to farmland conversion would not occur.

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? ()

WHY? The City of Pasadena has no land zoned for agricultural use other than commercial growing areas. The amendment to the Neighborhood Overlay District would only apply to land zoned RS-6 ND (Single-Family Residential, Neighborhood Overlay District), and would not conflict with any agricultural use. Therefore, the proposed amendment would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts related to zoning for agricultural land.

c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104 (g))?

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? There is no timberland or Timberland Production zone in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land, timberland or Timberland Production areas. The proposed amendment would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts related to forest land.

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use?

WHY? There is no forest land in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the conversion or loss of forest land. The proposed amendment would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts related to forest land.

e. Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? ()

WHY? There is no known farmland in the City of Pasadena; therefore the proposed project would not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. The proposed amendment would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts related to the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

5. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ()

WHY? The City of Pasadena is within the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), which is bounded by the San Gabriel, San Bernardino, and San Jacinto Mountains to the north and east, and the Pacific Ocean to the south and west. The air quality in the SCAB is managed by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD).

The SCAB has a history of recorded air quality violations and is an area where both state and federal ambient air quality standards are exceeded. Because of the violations of the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), the California Clean Air Act requires triennial preparation of an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). The AQMP analyzes air quality on a regional level and identifies region-wide attenuation methods to achieve the air quality standards. These region-wide attenuation methods include regulations for stationary-source polluters; facilitation of new transportation technologies, such as low-emission vehicles; and capital improvements, such as park-and-ride facilities and public transit improvements.

The SCAQMD understands that southern California is growing. As such, the AQMP accommodates population growth and transportation projections based on the predictions made by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Thus, projects that are consistent with employment and population forecasts are consistent with the AQMP.

The most recently adopted plan is the 2012 AQMP, adopted on December 7, 2012. This plan is the South Coast Air Basin's portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). This plan is designed to achieve the five percent annual reduction goal of the California Clean Air Act.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

In addition to the region-wide AQMP, the City of Pasadena participates in a sub-regional air quality plan – the West San Gabriel Valley Air Quality Plan. This plan, prepared in 1992, is intended to be a guide for the 16 participating cities, and identifies methods of improving air quality while accommodating expected growth.

The proposed code amendments are consistent with the Zoning and General Plan Land Use designations for the site. Additionally, the proposed code amendments do not have the potential to promote growth since they do not change the General Plan designation of Low Density Residential or the Zoning designation of RS-6 ND (Single-Family Residential, Neighborhood Overlay District). Nor would the code amendment permit increased density, height, gross floor area, or other development standards that would potentially lead to greater intensity of development and/or greater air quality impacts. As a result, the project is consistent with the growth expectations for the region, and the proposed code amendments would not interfere with the City's ability to implement its air quality plan. The proposed amendment would not result in any new or substantially more severe significant impacts related to conflicting with the AQMP.

b. *Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?* ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to existing single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. The proposed code amendments do not propose any new construction and are intended to promote greater neighborhood compatibility through additional regulations on construction. Inasmuch as the proposed amendment would result in new construction activities, the City has multiple policies, programs, and plans in place that reduce emissions. Additionally, Pasadena's Green City Action Plan and Green Building Ordinance, which exceeds California Green Building Code requirements, would result in lower emissions from future buildings than existing buildings in Pasadena. The proposed amendment would not violate and air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, nor would it generate an increase in new construction that would potentially lead to an air quality violation.

c. *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?* ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to existing single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and are not specific to a physical project and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. The proposed code amendments not permit or encourage increased construction, demolition, or increased density and, thus, the proposed amendment would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment regarding a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

d. *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?* ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to existing single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and are not specific to a physical project and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. The proposed code amendments will not permit or encourage increased construction, demolition, or increased density and, thus, would not result in any

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

direct physical changes to the environment, including exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

e. *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?* ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to existing single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. The code amendments are not specific to a physical project and will not permit or encourage increased construction, demolition, or increased density and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. Therefore, the proposed code amendments will not create objectionable odors. New projects will be reviewed in accordance with the City's Zoning Code and will be required to meet the performance standards for odors outlined in Section 17.40.090.

6. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?* ()

WHY? The Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood is a developed urban area. There are no known unique, rare, or endangered plant or animal species or habitats in the neighborhood. The proposed code amendments are designed to provide additional development standards for single-family structures, are not site specific, and will not directly cause construction or demolition to occur and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. Therefore, the proposed code amendments will not have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species.

b. *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?* ()

WHY? There are no designated natural communities in the City. The Final EIR for the 2015 Land Use and Mobility Elements contains the best available City-wide documented biological resources. This EIR identifies the natural habitat areas within the City's boundaries to be the upper and lower portions of the Arroyo Seco, the City's western hillside area, the San Gabriel Mountains, and Eaton Canyon. The proposed code amendments are focused on providing additional development standards for single-family construction within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, a developed urban area with no known riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities. The proposed code amendments would not have an adverse effect on biological resources or sensitive natural communities.

c. *Have a substantial adverse effect of federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?* ()

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? Drainage courses with definable bed and bank and their adjacent wetlands are "waters of the United States" and fall under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Jurisdictional wetlands, as defined by the USACE are lands that, during normal conditions, possess hydric soils, are dominated by wetland vegetation, and are inundated with water for a portion of the growing season. The Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood is a developed urban area with no known naturally occurring wetland habitats. Therefore, the proposed code amendments would have no impact to federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? ()

WHY? The Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood is a developed urban area. The proposed code amendments are not site specific and will not directly cause physical construction or demolition to occur. The proposed code amendments do not involve the dispersal of wildlife nor will the project result in a barrier to migration or movement. Therefore, the project will have no impact to wildlife movement.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? ()

WHY? The only local ordinance protecting biological resources in the City of Pasadena is Ordinance No. 6896 "City Trees and Tree Protection Ordinance". The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to single-family development standards within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, but would not include changes that affect or impact the Tree Protection Ordinance. The proposed code amendments would include changes such as greater setback requirements for second stories and greater limits on gross floor area requirements. Therefore, protected zones for trees would remain in place.

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? ()

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.

7. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5? ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not a physical project, not site-specific, and will not directly cause any physical construction or demolition to occur. Additionally, there are no known buildings, structures, natural

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

features, works of art or similar objects in the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood having a significant historic value to the City. The proposed code amendments do not include any changes to the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance. The proposed code amendments would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not a physical project and not site-specific and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. There would be no direct impacts to archaeological resources, and the proposed code amendments would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for archaeological resource impacts. The proposed code amendments will not encourage or require additional grading for new single-family dwellings or additions to existing dwellings. No impacts to archaeological resources would result.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ()

WHY? The Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood is an existing residential neighborhood within the urbanized portion of Pasadena. The proposed code amendments are revisions to existing development standards designed to improve the quality of residential development, and would not directly or indirectly destroy any unique paleontological resources or geologic features.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal ceremonies? ()

WHY? The Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood is a developed urban area that contains no formal cemeteries and is not known to have been used for disposal of historic or prehistoric human remains. The proposed code amendments would not directly cause physical construction or demolition to occur, and would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed.

8. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ()

WHY? Since the City of Pasadena is within a larger area traversed by active fault systems, such as the San Andreas and Newport-Inglewood Faults, any major earthquake along these systems will cause seismic ground shaking in Pasadena. Much of the City is on sandy, stony or gravelly loam formed on the alluvial fan adjacent

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

to the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil is more porous and loosely compacted than bedrock, and thus subject to greater impacts from seismic ground shaking than bedrock.

The risk of earthquake damage is minimized because new structures are required to be built according to the Uniform Building Code and other applicable codes, and are subject to inspection during construction. Structures for human habitation must be designed to meet or exceed California Uniform Building Code standards for Seismic Zone 4. Additionally, any new development under the zoning code amendment would have to comply with the City's Building Code (Pasadena Municipal Code, Title 14) which requires future development to submit an engineering geology report and soils engineering report to identify and specify construction requirements to account for geology conditions and hazards. Conforming to these required standards will ensure the proposed project would not result in significant impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking. The proposed code amendments are only designed to reduce the bulk and mass of residential structures and will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the rupture of a known fault.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? ()

WHY? See 8.a.i.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of liquefaction? ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to single-family development standards applicable to the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. These code amendments are not site-specific and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. Any future development will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for seismic-related risks. Additionally, any new development under the zoning code amendment would have to comply with the City's Building Code (Pasadena Municipal Code, Title 14) which requires future development to submit an engineering geology report and soils engineering report to identify and specify construction requirements to account for geology conditions and hazards.

iv. Landslides as delineated on the most recent Seismic Hazards Zones Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of known areas of landslides? ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to single-family development standards applicable to the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. These code amendments are not a physical project and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. The proposed code amendments are only designed to reduce the bulk and mass of residential structures and any future development will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for landslide-related risks.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? ()

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to single-family development standards applicable to the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. These code amendments are not a physical project and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. The proposed code amendments are only designed to reduce the bulk and mass of residential structures and any future development will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for impacts related to soil displacement and erosion.

- c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not a physical project and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. The City of Pasadena rests primarily on an alluvial plain. To the north the San Gabriel Mountains are relatively new in geological time. These mountains run generally east-west and have the San Andreas Fault on the north and the Sierra Madre Fault to the south. The action of these two faults in conjunction with the north-south compression of the San Andreas tectonic plate is pushing up the San Gabriel Mountains. This uplifting combined with erosion has helped form the alluvial plain. As shown on Plate 2-4 of the Technical Background Report to the 2002 Safety Element, the majority of the City lies on the flat portion of the alluvial fan, which is expected to be stable. Additionally, any new development under the zoning code amendment would have to comply with the City's Building Code (Pasadena Municipal Code, Title 14) which requires future development to submit an engineering geology report and soils engineering report to identify and specify construction requirements to account for geology conditions and hazards.

- d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? ()

WHY? According to the 2002 adopted Safety Element of the City's General Plan, Pasadena is underlain by alluvial material from the San Gabriel Mountains. This soil consists primarily of sand and gravel and is in the low to moderate range for expansion potential. The proposed code amendments are not a physical project and therefore would have no expansive soil-related impacts. Additionally, the proposed code amendments would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for expansive soil-related impacts.

- e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not site-specific, but are related to residential properties in the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. Future development that could occur under the proposed amendment would be required to connect to the existing sewer system. Further, no septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems would be constructed as part of the project.

9. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

- a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The proposed code amendments are updates to the single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, are not site-specific, and would not directly result in new construction or demolition. Therefore, the proposed code amendments would not directly or indirectly generate greenhouse gas emissions that may have a significant environmental impact.

b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not site-specific, are not a physical project, and will not conflict any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code and is not a use that is a significant source of GHG emissions. The proposed code amendments will not conflict with AB 32, the ARB Scoping Plan and the ARB Early Action Strategies. Therefore, there will be no impacts related to conflict with applicable plans.

10. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments are related to development standards for single-family construction in the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and do not alter the way in which the City regulates the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. All subsequent development projects would continue to be reviewed for such impacts.

b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? ()

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not a physical project and therefore do not involve hazardous materials. Furthermore, the proposed code amendments would not alter the way in which the City reviews physical development projects for impacts related to hazardous materials. Therefore, there is no significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions, which could release hazardous material.

c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? ()

WHY? Two schools are within one-quarter mile of Lower Hastings Ranch (Field Elementary and La Salle High School). However, the proposed code amendments are not a physical project and therefore do not involve the

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

handling or emission of hazardous materials. Furthermore, the proposed code amendments would not alter the way in which the City reviews subsequent physical development projects for impacts related to the handling or emission of hazardous materials. The proposed project would have no hazardous material related impacts to schools.

- d. *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? ()*

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not site specific or physical in nature; they are changes to existing single-family development standards within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. There are no known sites on the Cortese List (California Government Code Section 65962.5) in Lower Hastings Ranch. The proposed code amendments would not alter the way in which the City reviews subsequent physical development projects for hazardous material-related impacts and would not change regulations governing hazardous material sites.

- 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 result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ()*

WHY? Pasadena is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest public use airport is the Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, which is operated by a Joint Powers Authority with representatives from the Cities of Burbank, Glendale and Pasadena. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of an airport and would have no associated impacts.

- f. *For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ()*

WHY? Pasadena is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip and would have no associated impacts.

- g. *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ()*

WHY? These amendments would not result in any permanent or temporary physical barriers on any existing public streets. To ensure compliance with zoning, building, and fire codes, applicants are required to submit appropriate plans for plan review prior to the issuance of a building permit. Adherence to these requirements ensures that the proposed code amendments, and physical projects proposed subsequent to these code amendments, will not have significant impacts on emergency response and evacuation plans.

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not physical in nature, and are only updates to the City's existing zoning code for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, which is a developed suburban neighborhood. The proposed amendments will not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.

11. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not site specific and do not amend the Zoning Code in such a way as to violate any water quality standards. In addition, the proposed code amendments would not alter any waste discharge requirements and would not change any water quality-related plans or programs.

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 code amendments would not result in the installation of any groundwater wells and would not otherwise directly withdraw any groundwater. Therefore, the proposed Zoning Code amendments would not physically interfere with any groundwater supplies. Any physical project occurring as a result of these code amendments will use the existing water supply system provided by the Pasadena Department of Water and Power.

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 code amendments are updates to the Zoning Code and not a physical project, and no physical change to the environment would occur. Projects requiring a building permit will continue to be reviewed to determine if there are any alterations to existing drainage patterns. Future projects are subject to NPDES requirements, including the County-wide MS4 permit and the City's SUSMP ordinance. In accordance with these requirements, the applicant would be required to submit a plan to the City demonstrating how the project would comply with the City's SUSMP. To comply with the SUSMP, the project must implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) that reduce water quality impacts, including erosion and siltation, to the maximum extent practicable. Complying with the City's SUSMP and implementing required BMPs will ensure

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

that any subsequent development projects would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts due to changes to existing drainage patterns.

- 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 code amendments are not site specific and not a physical project and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. The code amendments would update the existing single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. Any project that requires a building permit will continue to be reviewed to determine if there is any alteration to existing drainage patterns.

- 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 code amendments are not site specific and not a physical project and, thus, would not result in any direct physical changes to the environment. The code amendments would update the existing single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. Projects are required to comply with the City's SUSMP ordinance to ensure that post-development peak stormwater runoff rates do not exceed pre-development peak stormwater runoff rates. This ensures that subsequent development projects would not exceed the capacity of the City's existing storm drain system. Similarly, projects are reviewed to ensure that stormwater pollutants are properly regulated. Therefore, the proposed project would not create runoff water that would exceed the capacity of the City's storm drain system and would not provide a substantial additional source of polluted runoff.

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

WHY? Compliance with the City's SUSMP ordinance will ensure that stormwater pollutants for projects would not substantially degrade water quality. The proposed code amendments would not change the applicability or substance of these requirements, and therefore would have no impact to 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? ()*

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, most of the entire city is in Zone X. A few scattered areas are located in Zone D. Both Zone X and Zone D are located outside of the "Special Flood Hazard Areas Subject to Inundation by the 1 percent Annual Chance of Flood" (100-year floodplain) and no floodplain management regulations are required. Further, the proposed project does not consist of any development that could be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area, and no impact would occur.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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

WHY? See response (g) above.

- 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? See response (g) above. The proposed code amendments would not have any impacts related to 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 proposed code amendments are updates to the Zoning Code which apply to single-family development in the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. They are not site specific or a physical project and will not physically divide an existing community. There is no physical development proposed under this project; they are technical and procedural updates to the Zoning Code. 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? Amendments to the Zoning Code require that the City Council adopt a finding that the proposed amendments are consistent with the City's General Plan. The changes being proposed are intended to improve the quality of single-family residential development in an established residential neighborhood. The proposed changes are consistent with the RS-6 and Neighborhood District designations in the Zoning Code as well as the Low Density Residential designation in the General Plan, and do not conflict with adopted plans, policies, or regulations related to residential development.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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 proposed code amendments are for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, a single-family residential neighborhood with no known history of mining activities. There is no specific physical project associated with the proposed code amendments; therefore there will be no impact or loss of a known mineral resource.

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 2015 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. Also see response 13a above.

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 City's Noise Restriction Ordinance (Pasadena Municipal Code Section 9.36) establishes noise limitations for ambient noise level increases, general noise sources, construction noise, equipment, machinery, amplified noise, and other noise sources. Given the requirements of the City's Noise Reduction Ordinance, adoption of the Zoning Code amendment would not result in any significant impacts related to exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of local standards or applicable standards of other agencies

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments are updates to single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and do not propose any new development. Regardless, given that there are limited, if any, permanent sources of vibration and groundborne noise in Pasadena, exposure of future residents to vibration and groundborne noise is anticipated to be limited to short-term conditions (e.g., construction activities). Therefore, the proposed code amendments would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

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

WHY? See response to 14a. The project would 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 future development promoted by the project would be typical urban and residential environment noise. Furthermore, in Pasadena, many urban environment noises, such as leaf-blowing and amplified sounds, are subject to restrictions by Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36. Therefore, the project would not cause a permanent increase in ambient noise levels, and this impact is considered less than significant.

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not a physical project or site specific. The amendments are updates to single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood and do not proposed any new development. All subsequent development projects are required to comply with City regulations governing hours of construction and noise levels generated by construction and mechanical equipment (Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36). In accordance with these regulations, construction noise would be limited to normal working hours (7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturday, in or within 500 feet of a residential area). There will be no change in noise levels and therefore no impact.

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.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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 code amendments are updates to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. The proposed amendments do not propose any new development that would directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth and would have no related significant impacts.

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments are updates to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. The proposed amendments do not propose any new development that would displace existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing.

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

WHY? The proposed code amendments are updates to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. The proposed amendments do not propose any new development that would displace substantial numbers of people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

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? ()

Potentially Significant Impact

Significant Unless Mitigation is Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

WHY? The proposed code amendments are updates to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. The amendments would not induce any growth by changing the allowable density or other related standards, and would not necessitate the need for new or physically altered government facilities related to fire protection.

b. *Libraries?* ()

WHY? The City operates its own library system, the Pasadena Public Library (PPL). The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project would not significantly impact library services. The PPL does not have one system-wide standard for square footage of library space per person; library space needs are determined individually for the service area of each branch. According to PPL, the total library facility square footage and collections are adequate to serve Pasadena's existing population and sufficient to support a population of up to at least 175,000 (Pasadena, 2015) See response to 16a.

c. *Parks?* ()

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. These updates would not induce any growth and would not cause increases in the usage of park space.

d. *Police Protection?* ()

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. These updates will not result in the need for additional new or altered police protection services or alter acceptable service ratios or response times.

e. *Schools?* ()

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards pertaining to the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood and will have no impacts related to schools.

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards pertaining to the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood and will have no impacts related to public services.

17. RECREATION.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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 project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. These updates do not propose any new development and would not cause an increase in population. Further, the city has approximately 300 acres of developed parks, comprising four citywide parks, five community parks, and 15 neighborhood parks that serve the recreational and park needs of its residents. Therefore there will be no impacts to recreational facilities.

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 project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. The project is not physical in nature and proposes no new development; therefore the project does not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would result.

18. **TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.** Would the project:

a. *Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?*

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. There is no development proposed as part of the code amendments. The proposed code amendments would not conflict with any applicable plans, ordinances, or policies used to measure the performance of the City's circulation system. No impact would result.

b. *Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?* ()

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. There is no development proposed as part of the code amendments. The proposed code amendments would not conflict with any applicable congestion management program.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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 proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. Lower Hastings Ranch 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 proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. There are no design features proposed that would substantially increase hazards. No incompatible uses are proposed as part of this project. Any future development projects will continue to be evaluated to ensure that no design features or incompatible uses are proposed that would substantially increase hazards.

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

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. Future developments must comply with all Building, Fire and Safety Codes and plans are subject to review and approval by the Public Works and the Transportation Departments, and the Building Division and Fire Department. Therefore, there will be no significant impacts related to inadequate emergency access.

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

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. No changes to parking requirements are proposed as part of these code amendments. Any future development will continue to be evaluated to ensure compliance with parking requirements.

g. *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?*

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. The proposed code amendments would not conflict with the City's Trip Reduction Ordinance or any adopted policies, plans, or programs related to alternative modes of transportation, and would not decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. No impact would occur.

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. Any future development that could occur under the proposed project will be subject to a sanitation district's sewer connection fee when connected to a sewer line. Pasadena is in Los Angeles County Sanitation District (LACSD) 16. All sewage from the project site would be conveyed to existing City sewer lines and facilities. Wastewater discharge from the project site would be regulated by applicable standards and requirements that are imposed and enforced by the City's Department of Public Works, Engineering Division. The proposed amendments would not generate wastewater and would not propose any new development; therefore the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements. No impact would occur.

- 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 project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. The proposed amendments would not generate additional demand on water or wastewater treatment facilities and would not require the construction or expansion of such facilities. Therefore, no impact would result.

- 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 project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. The project will not induce new development requiring the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Lower Hastings Ranch is a developed urban area where storm drainage is already provided by existing streets, storm drains, flood control channels, and catch basins.

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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? The proposed project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. The proposed code amendments do not propose any new development that could increase the need for water supplies. No impact would occur.

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 project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to any specific, physical project. The proposed code amendments would not increase the need for wastewater treatment. 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 project consists of amendments to the City's Zoning Code, specifically related to development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and would not require additional solid waste disposal needs. The City of Pasadena is served primarily by Scholl Canyon landfill, which is permitted through 2025.

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. The project, by itself, will have no impact on solid waste. Therefore, this project would not cause any significant impacts from conflicting with statutes or regulations related to solid waste.

20. CONCLUSION.

On the basis of the evaluation presented in Section III, the changes within the Proposed Project would not trigger any of the conditions listed in Section I.11 of this Addendum, requiring preparation of a subsequent or supplemental environmental impact report or negative declaration. Thus, this Addendum satisfies the requirements of CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 and 15164. The Proposed Project does not introduce new significant environmental effects, substantially increase the severity of previously identified significant environmental effects, or show that mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible.

The analyses and conclusions in the 2010 IS/ND remain current and valid. The proposed revisions to the project, as described for the Proposed Project, would not cause new or substantially more severe significant Lower Hastings Ranch Zoning Code Amendment Addendum

**Potentially
Significant
Impact**

**Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated**

**Less Than
Significant
Impact**

No Impact

effects than identified in the 2010 IS/ND, and thus no new mitigation measures would be required. No change has occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the proposed project that would cause new or substantially more severe significant environmental effects than identified in the 2010 IS/ND, and no new information has become available that shows that the project would cause significant environmental effects not already analyzed in the 2010 IS/ND. Therefore, no further environmental review is required beyond this Addendum to the 2010 IS/ND.

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

- 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) Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002
- 5) 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 2015
- 6) 2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002.
- 7) Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868
- 8) Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2015
- 9) Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2015
- 10) Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
- 11) Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854
- 12) North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997
- 13) Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended
- 14) Recommendations On Siting New Sensitive Land Uses, California Air Resources Board, May 2005
- 15) Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994
- 16) Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
- 17) 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.
- 18) South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998
- 19) 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
- 20) Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837
- 21) Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines, City of Pasadena, August, 2005
- 22) Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896
- 23) Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code