

ATTACHMENT E

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

INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with the Environmental Policy Guidelines of the City of Pasadena, this Initial Study provides the assessment for a determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment.

SECTION I – PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project Title: Lower Hastings Ranch Development Standards
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Pasadena
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Beilin Yu, Associate Planner
626.744.6726
4. Project Location:

The Lower Hasting Ranch Neighborhood is located in East Pasadena, south of Sierra Madre Boulevard, west of the City's eastern most boundary, north of Sears Way and east of Rosemead Boulevard. The neighborhood consists of approximately 600 residential properties, which were mainly developed between the late 1940's and early 1950's with many homes having 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) zoning 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, which will create additional development standards for residential additions within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. The code amendments are mainly designed to ensure the scale of second-story additions is appropriate with existing development. Development standards that have been examined as part of this code amendment include height of front porches, and the height, size and setback of second story additions.

In addition, the proposed code amendment includes the ability by the Zoning administrator to require the construction of a temporary frame when a proposed second-story addition requests a Variance application because it deviates from one or more development standards. This procedural amendment will not be limited to the properties within Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, but will apply to all single-family properties within the City.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):

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 in the City of Sierra Madre. To the south and south east are general commercial land uses within shopping centers.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): The proposed code amendments are City-wide, and will change the regulations in various parts of the Zoning Code. Other public agencies whose approval is required: Approval by the City Council with a recommendation from the Planning Commission is required.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION: (to be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	X
I find that, although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	
I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	

Prepared By/Date _____

Reviewed By/Date _____

Printed Name _____

Printed Name _____

Negative Declaration/Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on: _____

Adoption attested to by: _____

Printed name/Signature _____

Date _____

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. 'Potentially Significant Impact' is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The Lead Agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 21, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. See CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 21 at the end of the checklist.
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier documents and the extent to which address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

SECTION II – ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. BACKGROUND.

Date checklist submitted: November 3, 2010
Department requiring checklist: Current Planning Division
Case Manager: Beilin Yu, Associate Planner

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 limit the massing of front entry porches for single-family properties 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 other scenic vista. The Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood is located in East Pasadena and not near any scenic vistas. Therefore, the proposed Code Amendments would have no impact 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; and thus, the proposed code amendments would have no impacts to a state scenic highway.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? See response to 3a and 3b. The proposed code amendments will limit the mass and allowed height for second story additions. The proposed standards would also require a temporary pole or similar object be installed to demonstrate the height of a structure when it proposes to exceed the allowed height limits in single-family zone. This would be temporary and will be used to ensure surrounding properties are aware of the proposed project. There are no proposed changes that will permanently degrade the quality of development. The revised standards are proposed to improve the quality of development in the area.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed code amendments are not site specific and will not result in creating a new source of substantial light or glare. See also responses 3a and 3b.

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. 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.

- 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 nurseries being allowed by right in the CG (General Commercial) and IG (General Industrial) zones and conditionally in the CO (Office Commercial), CL (Limited Commercial), OS (Open Space) and PS (Public-Semi Public) Zoning Districts. Therefore there is no potential conflict with zoning for agricultural uses.

- 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))?*

☐☐☐☒

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.

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

☐☐☐☒

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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.

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.

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 pollutants; facilitation of new transportation technologies, such as low-emission vehicles; and capital improvements, such as park-and-ride facilities and public transit improvements.

The most recently adopted plan is the 2007 AQMP, adopted on June 1, 2007. 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.

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.

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.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

The proposed code amendments do not have the potential to promote growth since they do not increase the height, density, gross floor area or other development standards that would lead to greater intensity of development. These amendments would not interfere with the City's ability to implement its air quality plan.

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 the existing single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch Neighborhood as described on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. These amendments would not violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. The project does not propose any new construction and the proposed amendments would not generate an increase in new construction which 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 the single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch Neighborhood, as described on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. These amendments are not specific to a project. The proposed amendments will not result in a new increase in criteria pollutants as the amendments will not increase the overall development standards within the Zoning Code.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to the single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, as described on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. These amendments are not site specific. The proposed amendments will not result in exposing new sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as the amendments will not increase the overall development standards within the Zoning Code.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to the single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, as described on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. The amendments will not result in 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 contained in Section 17.40.090.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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 proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to the single-family development standards as described on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. The amendments will not affect sensitive species as the majority of residential zones are located in already developed urban areas. These amendments are not site specific but will result in additional development standards for single-family structures in the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood and these changes will not affect biological resources.

- 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 1994 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, and Eaton Canyon. The proposed code amendments would not affect biological resources or sensitive natural communities within the City. See also response 6 a.

- 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?* ()

☐☐☐☒

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. Pasadena is located in a developed urban area. There are no known naturally occurring wetland habitats in the City of Pasadena.

- 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? Pasadena is a developed urban area and these Zoning Code amendments do not involve the dispersal of wildlife. There is no physical development proposed under this project, rather, they are updates to the existing single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood to

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

incorporate additional development standards for single-family residential additions. Therefore, there will be no impacts to wildlife or their habitat.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to the single-family development standards as described on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. However, the amendments will not impact the Tree Protection Ordinance. Existing setbacks for additions and new housing are not proposed to be modified. Therefore, protected zones for trees will remain unchanged.

- 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 will not impact the significance of any historical resource. The proposed amendments do not include any specific changes to the City's Historic Preservation ordinance.

- 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 site specific. They would have no impact to archaeological resources and would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for archaeological resource impacts. The proposed changes will not encourage or require additional grading for new single-family dwellings or additions to existing dwellings. Therefore, no impacts to archeological resources would result.

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

☐☐☐☒

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

WHY? The Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood is located in the urbanized portion of Pasadena. The proposed code amendments are revisions to development standards to improve the quality of development and would not directly or secondarily destroy a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature, and would have no related impacts.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments apply to single-family development. Therefore, they would not change the City's requirements for columbarium's contained in Section 17.50.230 of the Zoning Code.

8. ENERGY. Would the proposal:

a. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? ()

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are only updates to the Zoning Code and do not conflict with the 1983 adopted Energy Element of the General Plan. Projects are required comply with the energy standards in the California Energy Code, Part 6 of the California Building Standards Code (Title 24). Measures to meet these performance standards may include high-efficiency Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water storage tank equipment, lighting conservation features, higher than required rated insulation and double-glazed windows.

b. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? ()

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed code amendments include a variety of changes to the single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, as described on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. These amendments are only updates do not result in projects that will encourage the use of non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner.

9. 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. ()

☐☐☐☒

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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 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. Conforming to these required standards will ensure the proposed project would not directly or secondarily result in significant impacts due to strong seismic ground shaking. The proposed Zoning Code amendments are only updates to reduce the bulk and mass of 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 9.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 the single-family development standards within the Lower Hasting Ranch neighborhood, as described on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. These amendments are not specific to a site, but are Citywide. There are no specific projects associated with the amendments. Any future development projects must continue to be reviewed to ensure there are no seismic related risks.

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? These Zoning Code Amendments apply to single-family development standards within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. Projects will be reviewed on a case by case basis to determine that they meet the building code and other requirements that ensure that they are safe. The proposed amendments will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.

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 the single-family development standards within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, as described on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. When an applicant applies to construct any building, the specific impacts on soil erosion will be reviewed. The displacement of soil through cut and fill will be controlled by Chapter 33 of the 2001 California Building Code relating to grading and excavation therefore there will be no impact.

- 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 amendments are not site specific, but are updates to the Zoning Code for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. 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.

- 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 Zoning Code amendments would have no expansive soil-related impacts and 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 Zoning Code amendments are not site specific but are amendments related to the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. These amendments include updates to the code as detailed on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. These amendments will not impact the ability of the City to review a project to determine if the soil is incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

10. 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 amendments are not site specific, but are updates to the Zoning Code development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, which will not directly impact Greenhouse gases (GHG) emissions.

- 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 amendments are not site specific, but are updates to the Zoning Code development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. As such, the proposed ordinance will not conflict with AB32, the ARB Scoping Plan and the ARB Early Action Strategies.

11. 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 Zoning Code amendments as described on Pages 1 and 2 and do not change the mechanisms by which the City regulates the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. All new projects would be continued 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 Zoning Code amendments do not involve 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. In addition, the proposed Zoning Code amendments would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazard-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing the handling of hazardous materials.

- 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? The proposed Zoning Code amendments do not involve hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous materials, substance, or waste. Therefore, the proposed project would have no hazardous material related impacts to schools. In addition, the proposed Zoning Code amendments would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazardous material-related impacts and would not change any regulations governing the handling of hazardous materials.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

- 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 Zoning Code amendments are not site specific but rather changes to existing single-family development standards within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. Any future proposed project would be reviewed to determine whether they are on a list of hazardous materials sites. The proposed amendments would not alter the way subsequent development proposals are reviewed for hazardous material-related impacts and would not change any 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. Therefore, the proposed amendments 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 amendments 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 project will not have a significant impact on emergency response and evacuation plans.

- 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? ()

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed amendments are only updates and 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.

12. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed amendments are not site specific and do not amend the Zoning Code in such a way to violate any water quality standards. In addition, the proposed Zoning 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 Zoning 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 project that is the result of these 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 Zoning Code amendments are updates to the Zoning Code only. Projects that require a building permit will continue to be reviewed to determine if there is an alteration of the 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 that demonstrates how the project will 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 the required BMPs will ensure that the any subsequent development projects would not result in significant erosion or siltation impacts due to changes to 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?* ()

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are not site specific but rather propose to 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 an alteration of the 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 Zoning Code amendments do not propose any new development. Projects are required to comply with the City's SUSMP ordinance to ensure that post-development peak storm water runoff rates do not exceed pre-development peak storm water runoff rates. This ensures subsequent development projects would not exceed the City's existing storm drain system. Similarly, projects are reviewed to ensure stormwater pollutants are properly regulated. Therefore, the proposed project would not create runoff that would exceed the capacity of the 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 stormwater pollutants for projects would not substantially degrade water quality. The proposed amendments to the Zoning Code would not change the applicability or substance of these requirements, and would therefore 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? The proposed code amendments include changes to the single-family development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, as described on Pages 1 and 2 of this document. There are no proposed changes related to flood hazard areas or flood plain management. There is no new construction proposed.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? See response 12 g. above.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

- 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 12 g. above. The proposed Zoning 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.

13. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are updates which are applicable to single-family development. They are not related to a specific development project and will not physically divide an existing community. Further, there is no physical development proposed under this project, rather technical and procedural updates to the City's 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? Any 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 are being proposed to improve the quality of residential development and the changes do not conflict with adopted plans, policies or regulations related to residential development.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? Currently, there is 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 in Pasadena.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

14. 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. There is no specific project associated with these Zoning Code amendments therefore there will be no impact.

- 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 Zoning Code amendments would not have significant impacts from the loss of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. See also response 13.a above.

15. 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 Zoning Code amendments will not change any of the adopted Noise regulations. The proposed Zoning Code amendments would also not expose persons to excessive noise. There is no new development proposed.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed amendments are only updates to single-family development standards and propose no new development. The proposed Zoning Code amendments will not result in a generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? See response to 15.a.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? This project consists of Zoning Code amendments for the single-family development standards in Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood; there is no new development proposed with the amendments. There will be no change in 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 ten 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.

16. 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 amendments are updates to some specific residential standards and propose no new development that would induce substantial population growth, and would have no related significant impacts.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are updates to some specific residential standards and propose no 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 Zoning Code amendments are updates to some specific residential standards and would not displace substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction of replacement housing.

17. 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 project consists of amendments to the Zoning Code. These amendments are updates to some specific residential standards and do not induce any growth by changing the density or other related development standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact fire protection services. See also Section 10h of this document for wildfire-related impacts.

- b. Libraries? ()

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The City as a whole is well served by its Public Information (library) System; and the project would not significantly impact library services. See response in 17a.

- c. Parks? ()

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The project consists of amendments to the Zoning Code that are updates to some specific residential standards and will not induce increases in the usage of park space.

- d. Police Protection? ()

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The project consists of amendments to the Zoning Code that are updates to some specific residential standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact police protection services.

e. *Schools?* ()

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The project consists of amendments to the Zoning Code that are updates to some specific residential development standards. There will be no impacts related to schools.

f. *Other public facilities?* ()

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The project consists of amendments to the Zoning Code that are updates to some specific residential development standards. There will be no impacts related to public services.

18. RECREATION.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? This project consists of updates to the Zoning Code that do not induce an increase in population or workforce employees. The project does not propose any new development and includes technical revisions and changes to the Zoning Code. 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 Zoning Code amendments will not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed project will not involve the development of recreational facilities that would have an adverse effect on the environment, and would have no associated impacts.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

19. 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 Zoning Code amendments are only updates to existing single-family development standards within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to a specific project. There is no development proposed as part of the amendments and no associate Traffic and Transportation impacts.

- 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 Zoning Code amendments are only updates to existing single-family development standards within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, and is not related to a specific project. There is no development proposed as part of the amendments. Therefore the proposed amendment will not conflict with an applicable congestion management program.

- 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 Zoning Code amendments are not related to a specific site therefore 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 code amendments are updates to Zoning Code development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood and are not related to a specific project that will result in an increase in hazards due to a design feature. No changes to such standards are proposed under these amendments, and any development projects will continue to be evaluated to ensure there are no design features that may cause a hazard.

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

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed code amendments are updates to Zoning Code development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood and are not related to a specific project that will result in inadequate emergency access. No changes to such standards are proposed under these amendments, and any development projects will continue to be evaluated to ensure there are no impacts to emergency access. See also response 18 d.

f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? ()

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed code amendments are updates to Zoning Code development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood and are not related to a specific project that will result in inadequate parking capacity. No changes to parking requirements are proposed under these amendments, and any development projects 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? ()

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed code amendments are to Zoning Code development standards for the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. There is no change proposed in the City's Trip Reduction Ordinance or other programs supporting alternative modes of transportation.

20. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The project, by itself, would not generate wastewater since the project is technical changes to the Zoning Code. The project does not propose any new development and would not involve release into the wastewater treatment system. Therefore, the project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board, and would have no associated impacts.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed project does not create any further demand on wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities off-site, and the project would have no associated impacts.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

- 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 Zoning Code amendments will not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities.

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

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The proposed Zoning Code amendments are updates to residential development standards and do not propose new development that could increase the need for water supplies.

- 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 Zoning Code amendments and will not result in an increase in the demand 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 Zoning Code amendments would not require any additional 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. Therefore, this project would cause no impacts related to solid waste disposal.

- 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 percent 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 percent 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.

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

21. 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) The following document was used for analysis of the project's environmental effects:

- *General Plan and Final Program EIR*

These documents are available for review at the Permit Center, 175 North Garfield Avenue between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 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.

b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. (Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.)

c) Mitigation Measures. None.

22. 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? The proposed code amendments will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat 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 because the proposed amendments are not site specific but Citywide. No specific project is part of the proposed amendments and no new development is proposed.

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? ()*

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Significant
Unless
Mitigation is
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No Impact

☐☐☐☒

WHY? The project, by itself, does not involve any new construction. The project consists of amendments to the development standards for single-family residences located in the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. The proposed Zoning Code amendments will not contribute to any 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 code amendments 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 City would be exposed to typical southern California earthquake hazards, modern engineering practices would ensure that geologic and seismic conditions would not directly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. In addition, as discussed in Sections 3 Aesthetics, 12 Land Use and Planning, 14 Noise, 15 Population and Housing, 16 Public Services, 17 Recreation, 18 Transportation/Traffic and 19 Utilities and Service Systems the project would not indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on humans. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a Mandatory Finding of Significance due to environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on humans.

INITIAL STUDY REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

#	Document
1	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, California Public Resources Code, revised January 1, 1994 official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999.
2	CEQA Air Quality Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, revised 1993
3	East Pasadena Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, codified 2001
4	Energy Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1983
5	Fair Oaks/Orange Grove Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2002
6	Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) Land Use and Mobility Elements of the General Plan, Zoning Code Revisions, and Central District Specific Plan, City of Pasadena, certified 2004
7	2000-2005 Housing Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002.
8	Inclusionary Housing Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 17.71 Ordinance #6868
9	Land Use Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004
10	Mobility Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2004
11	Noise Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
12	Noise Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 9.36 Ordinances # 5118, 6132, 6227, 6594 and 6854
13	North Lake Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department, Codified 1997
14	Pasadena Municipal Code, as amended
15	Recommendations On Siting New Sensitive Land Uses, California Air Resources Board, May 2005
16	Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide, "Growth Management Chapter," Southern California Association of Governments, June 1994
17	Safety Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 2002
18	Scenic Highways Element of the General Plan, City of Pasadena, adopted 1975
19	Seismic Hazard Maps, California Department of Conservation, official Mt. Wilson, Los Angeles and Pasadena quadrant maps were released March 25, 1999. The preliminary map for Condor Peak was released in 2002.
20	South Fair Oaks Specific Plan Overlay District Planning and Development, codified 1998
21	State of California "Aggregate Resource in the Los Angeles Metropolitan Area" by David J. Beeby, Russell V. Miller, Robert L. Hill, and Robert E. Grunwald, Miscellaneous map no. .010, copyright 1999, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology
22	Storm Water and Urban Runoff Control Regulations Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.70 Ordinance #6837
23	Transportation Impact Review Current Practice and Guidelines, City of Pasadena, August, 2005
24	Tree Protection Ordinance Pasadena Municipal Code Chapter 8.52 Ordinance # 6896
25	West Gateway Specific Plan Overlay District, City of Pasadena Planning and Development Department codified 2001
26	Zoning Code, Chapter 17 of the Pasadena Municipal Code



NEGATIVE DECLARATION

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

PROJECT TITLE: Zoning Code Amendments to the Lower Hastings Ranch Development Standards

PROJECT APPLICANT: City of Pasadena

PROJECT CONTACT PERSON: Beilin Yu

ADDRESS: City of Pasadena, Planning and Development Department, Current Planning Section, 175 North Garfield Avenue, Pasadena, California 91101

TELEPHONE: 626.744.6726

PROJECT LOCATION: City of Pasadena (citywide)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

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 prepared amendments to the City's Zoning Code to update the Neighborhood Overlay District, which will create additional development standards for residential additions within the Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood. The code amendments are designed to ensure the height and scale of front porches, entry ways, and second-story additions is appropriate with existing development.

In addition, the proposed code amendment includes the requirement of the construction of a temporary massing frame when a proposed second-story addition requests a Variance application because it deviates from one or more development standards. This procedural amendment will not be limited to the properties within Lower Hastings Ranch neighborhood, but will apply to all single-family properties within the City.

No new construction or specific project is proposed as part of the code amendments.

APPROVALS NEEDED:

The Planning Commission conducted a public hearing and recommended approval of the proposed amendments and the Negative Declaration on December 8, 2010. The City Council adopted the Negative Declaration concurrent with approval of the Zoning Code Amendments on March 14, 2011.

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: Beilin Yu
Title: Associate Planner
Date: March 18, 2011

Determination Approved:
Title:
Date:

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: November 18, 2010 to December 8, 2010

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON DRAFT: ☐ Yes ☒ No

INITIAL STUDY REVISED: ☐ Yes ☒ No

nd-mnd.doc