

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER

FROM: RON WHISENAND, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: 2011 HOUSING ELEMENT

DATE: JUNE 27, 2011

Needs: To consider an update to the Housing Element that addresses comments and concerns raised by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) regarding conformance of the element with State Housing Element Law.

Facts:

1. On December 7, 2004, the City Council adopted an update to the Housing Element of the General Plan.
2. Section 65588 of the California Government Code requires that Housing Elements be updated per a schedule established by the Legislature. According to that section, the City was due to have adopted an updated Housing Element by August 31, 2009.
3. A draft updated Housing Element was presented to the Planning Commission and City Council in May 2009 at a public workshop. Organizations and persons with an interest in affordable housing matters or who owned property that the Housing Element identified as being appropriately zoned to accommodate the City's share of the Regional Housing Need were notified of the workshop and the availability of the draft Housing Element at least one month prior to the workshop.
4. In May 2009, the City submitted a copy of the Draft Housing Element to HCD, as required by Government Code Section 65585, for their review and a determination whether the draft element conformed to State Housing Element Law (Government Code Sections 65580 et seq.)
5. On July 16, 2009, HCD sent a letter to the City indicating that it had completed its review of the draft Housing Element and determined that it needed further revision to conform to State Housing Element Law. Their letter listed 25 changes that needed to be made. A copy of this letter is included in the Housing Element as Appendix A-1.
6. The major issues raised by HCD and the City's response will be summarized in the Analysis Section of this report (below).
7. Receipt of HCD's comments on the draft Housing Element coincided with publication of the Draft Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan. The City decided to assign a lower priority to updating the Housing Element while that specific plan was being reviewed.
8. In late March, a copy of the draft Housing Element was sent to HCD for review. On May 16, 2011, the City received HCD's comments via email (Attachment 4).

9. At its meeting of May 24, 2011, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing on the 2011 draft Housing Element and, on a 5-0-2 vote (2 commissioners were absent), recommended that the City Council adopt it subject to changes presented in the staff report to address HCD's latest comments.
10. The proposed Housing Element Amendment is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The draft Housing Element does not authorize any more development (i.e. numbers or locations of dwelling units) or change of rate of development than that established by the Land Use Element of the General Plan. A full Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the 2003 General Plan Update; Negative Declarations were prepared for subsequent amendments to the Land Use Element. An Initial Study was conducted, and it concludes that the draft Housing Element will not have any significant effect on the environment and that no mitigation measures are necessary. It is proposed, therefore, that the City Council adopt a Negative Declaration for this amendment.

Analysis and

Conclusion: Mandates for Affordable Housing and Emergency Shelters: There was some confusion about this issue expressed by property owners at the Planning Commission hearing. State Housing Element Law requires the following:

- Affordable Housing: That the City designate (General Plan) and zone sufficient amounts of vacant land at appropriate densities (a minimum of 20 units per acre for low and very low income households) and with available infrastructure (streets, water, and sewer) to meet the City's share of the Regional Housing Need.

Property owners within the Olsen Ranch/Beechwood Area Specific Plan expressed concerns that the Element appeared to require that they build or reserve land for affordable housing projects. Neither State law nor the Housing Element requires any property owner to build affordable housing on their property. The intent of the minimum density is to provide an opportunity for the private market to meet the housing needs of these income groups.

The Housing Element does not designate any properties for multi-family residential use at 20 units per acre; the Land Use Element (adopted in 2003) does. The Housing Element only indicates which properties were so designated and confirms that the City meets its share of the Regional Housing Need. (This is discussed in Chapter 5 of the Housing Element.)

- Emergency Shelter: SB 2 (2007) requires that the City designate a zone or zones with sufficient capacity to accommodate emergency shelters to meet its homeless housing need and provide that, within the designated zones, such shelters may be established without a conditional use permit. The law also provides that such zones must be in reasonably close proximity to transit, commercial services, employment centers, and social services. SB 2 requires the City to adopt a zoning ordinance to implement these requirements within 1 year of adoption of the Housing Element Update; it does allow such an ordinance to include minimum standards for numbers of beds, parking, size and location of client exterior and interior onsite waiting and client intake areas, on-site

management and security, etc. These standards are listed on Page 46 of the Draft Element.

SB 2 does not require the City or any property owner to establish an emergency shelter. Within the designated zones, it does remove the constraint of a conditional use permit.

At the Planning Commission meeting, Tom Shulz, representing the owner of the Sunbank property on Commerce Way, testified that hazardous materials had been discovered in the soil on their property and that they had been required by the State Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) to record a covenant in which they agreed never to allow the property to be used for residential units or day care. Mr. Shulz believed that the source of the hazardous materials was the previous Army air field, and that similar problems would exist on other properties in Sherwood Industrial Park, rendering it unfit for consideration for emergency shelters. City staff contacted the County Department of Environmental Health, which oversees all hazardous materials cases in the County, and learned that there are no other active hazardous materials cases in the Sherwood Industrial Park Area. Additionally, it appears from a DTSC report that Sunbank's problem was limited to their property.

HCD Comments of July 16, 2009: As noted in Fact #5, HCD had 25 comments on the draft Housing Element. Appendix A includes a table (on Pages A-8 and -9) that refers the reader to those sections of the revised element which address HCD's concerns. The most salient issues raised by HCD are summarized below.

- Homeless Housing Needs: Pursuant to SB 2 (2007), as discussed above.
- Extremely Low Income Households' Housing needs: Pursuant to Chapter 891, Statutes of 2006, provide additional detail on the housing needs of this relatively new income group, which is defined as those households earning 0-30% of the County Median Income.
- Tenure: Provide more detail on ownership vs rental for various income groups.
- Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) Progress: Provide more information on how new units reported as meeting RHNA were determined to be affordable.
- Action Statements: The City must "commit" to pursuing actions rather than "consider" undertaking them. Action statements were revised to accomplish this.
- Preservation and Rehabilitation: Provide an updated survey of maintenance condition of maintenance on existing housing and commit the City to do more to assist rehabilitation and preservation of existing affordable (subsidized housing). The draft element maintains that the need to replace the existing 148 units in Oak Park is the most critical need related to these issues and proposes that the City make assistance to the Redevelopment of Oak Park as its highest priority.
- Governmental Constraints to Affordable Housing: Provide a more detailed analysis on the effect of development standards and the permit process on affordability.

The revised element addresses all of the above as well as other less-salient issues listed in HCD's letter.

HCD Comments of Received May 15, 2011: HCD's comments were few. They recommended minor revisions to information and recommended revising four of the Action Items in Chapter 2. Changes to the 2001 draft element were included in the staff report to the Planning Commission Following the Planning Commission meeting, a revised draft housing element that showed the changes was prepared, distributed to the City Council, posted on the City's web site, and 2 copies were placed in the Library.

Policy

Reference: General Plan: Housing Element; Government Code Sections 65580 et seq.

Fiscal

Impact: Housing Element policies and action items do not authorize any more development or change of rate of development than that established by the Land Use Element of the General Plan. Therefore, there will be no new fiscal impacts associated with the Housing Element Amendment that were not considered with the 2003 General Plan Update. Most of the Zoning Code Amendments and other housing programs listed in the Housing Element can be accomplished by the Community Development Department using Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Redevelopment Low and Moderate Income Housing (LMIH) administrative funds, thereby mitigating fiscal impacts to the General Fund.

Options: After consideration of all public testimony, that the City Council consider the following options:

- a. (1) Adopt Resolution No. 11-XX Approving a Negative Declaration for the 2011 Housing Element;
- (2) Adopt Resolution No. 11-XX Approving the 2011 Housing Element.
- b. Amend, modify or reject the foregoing option.

Prepared by: Ed Gallagher, City Planner

Attachments:

1. Resolution Approving a Negative Declaration
2. Resolution Approving the 2011 Housing Element
3. Draft 2011 Housing Element (distributed separately due to its size)
4. HCD's Comments Received May 16 with City Responses
5. Newspaper Notice

ED\HOUSELEM\2009-2011\PCR 062711

RESOLUTION NO. 11-XXX

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE 2011 HOUSING ELEMENT**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 65588 of the California Government Code, the City of Paso Robles has prepared a draft 2011 Housing Element of the General Plan to update the 2004 Housing Element; and

Whereas, the 2011 Housing Element does not propose any new development that has not been planned/provided for in the Land Use Element of the General Plan; the purpose of the Housing Element is to embody the City's policies for making housing affordable to the full range of income groups defined by State Law; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for the 2011 Housing Element (attached to this resolution), which proposes that a Negative Declaration be approved; and

WHEREAS, Public Notice of the proposed Negative Declaration was given as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, public hearings were conducted by the Planning Commission on May 24, 2011 and by the City Council on June 21, 2011 to consider the Initial Study prepared for this application, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed environmental determination for the proposed 2011 Housing Element; and

WHEREAS, based on the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for the 2011 Housing Element and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the City Council finds no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment if the 2011 Housing Element is approved.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that based on the City's independent judgment, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby approve a Negative Declaration for the 2011 Housing Element in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 21st day of June, 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

ATTEST:

Duane Picanco, Mayor

Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 11-XXX

**A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
APPROVING THE 2011 HOUSING ELEMENT**

WHEREAS, on December 7, 2004, the City Council adopted an updated Housing Element; and

WHEREAS, in 2009, pursuant to Section 65588 of the California Government Code, the City of Paso Robles prepared a draft update of the Housing Element of the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 65585 of the California Government Code, in 2009, the City submitted the 2009 draft updated Housing Element to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for its review; and

WHEREAS, on July 16, 2009, HCD submitted a letter informing the City that the 2009 draft updated Housing Element needed further revisions in order to conform with State Housing Element Law (Government Code Sections 65580 et seq.); and

WHEREAS, the City prepared an April 2011 draft Housing Element to respond to HCD's comments of July 16, 2009 and circulated this draft for public comment; and

WHEREAS, on May 16, 2011, the City received comments from HCD recommending changes to the April 2011 draft Housing Element; and

WHEREAS, HCD's recommendations received on May 16, 2011 and the City's suggested responses thereto were presented to the Planning Commission on May 24, 2011 as part of the staff report; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of May 24, 2011, the Planning Commission took the following actions:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the Draft April 2011 Housing Element and the staff report;
- b. Conducted public hearings to obtain public testimony on the proposed Draft 2011 Housing Element;
- c. Based on the information contained in the initial study prepared for the Draft 2011 Housing Element, found that there was no substantial evidence that the 2011 Housing Element would have significant adverse effects on the environment and recommended that the City Council approve a Negative Declaration;
- d. Recommended that the City Council adopt the Draft 2011 Housing Element incorporating the suggested City responses to HCD's recommendations received on May 16, 2011; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of June 21, 2011, the City Council took the following actions:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the Draft April 2011 Housing Element and the staff report;
- b. Considered the recommendations of the Planning Commission;

- c. Considered public testimony on the Draft 2011 Housing Element;
- d. Found that there was no substantial evidence that the Draft 2011 Housing Element would have significant adverse effects on the environment and approved a Negative Declaration in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, DETERMINED AND ORDERED by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles as follows:

1. The 2011 Housing Element attached as Exhibit "A" to this Resolution, which consists of the Draft April 2011 Housing Element and the City's suggested responses to HCD's recommendations received on May 16, 2011, is hereby approved and adopted.
2. The above Recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by this reference.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 21st day of June, 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

Duane Picanco, Mayor

ATTEST:

Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM

CITY OF PASO ROBLES

PLANNING DIVISION

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** **Housing Element Update 2011**
- Concurrent Entitlements:** **None**
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Ed Gallagher, City Planner
Phone: (805) 237-3970
Email: ed@prcity.com
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** **City-wide**
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** **City of Paso Robles**
- Contact Person:** Ed Gallagher, City Planner
- Phone:** (805) 237-3970
Email: ed@prcity.com
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** **Affects all residential and most non-residential land use categories**
- 6. ZONING:** **Not Applicable**
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The City of Paso Robles has prepared a draft Housing Element to update the 2004 Housing Element as required by Government Code Sections 65588. The 2011 Update does not propose any new development that was not planned/provided for in the Land Use Element of the General Plan as adopted in December 2003 and subsequently amended on several occasions, the most recent being in March 2009. The purpose of the Housing Element is to embody the City's policies for making housing affordable to the full range of income groups defined by State Law. These policies address new

residential development, preservation of existing housing units, and conservation of existing affordable housing supply.

A full Environmental Impact Report on the General Plan was prepared and certified by the City Council on December 16, 2003. The 2004 Housing Element and subsequent amendments to the Land Use Element of the General Plan, which defined the locations, types, and intensities of residential development, were approved with Negative Declarations.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: See the Environmental Impact Report for the 2003 Update of the City's General Plan

9. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED): none

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.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> 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.
- ☐ 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. 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 one 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.

Signature

Ed Gallagher
Printed Name

03/22/11

Date

City Planner
Title

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. Answers should address 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 may be 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 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 “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses 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. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - 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 document and the extent to which they 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 significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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 Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of forest land, including the forest and Range Assessment Project and the forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 5114(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

III. 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? (Source: 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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)? (Source: 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The purpose of the project is to bring the Housing Element into conformance with State Housing Element Law while maintaining conformance with the General Plan. As noted in the Project Description, the proposed amendments to the Housing Element do not plan for any additional development above the amounts (i.e. numbers of dwelling units), types, and locations set forth in the December 2003 General Plan as amended.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11) Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11) Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IV. 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? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on 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? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

VI. 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. (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3) Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The purpose of the project is to bring the Housing Element into conformance with State Housing Element Law while maintaining conformance with the General Plan. As noted in the Project Description, the proposed amendments to the Housing Element do not plan for any additional development above the amounts (i.e. numbers of dwelling units), types, and locations set forth in the December 2003 General Plan as amended.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

VIII. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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., Would the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? Would decreased rainfall infiltration or groundwater recharge reduce stream baseflow? (Source: 7) Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Source: 10) Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
j. Inundation by mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The purpose of the project is to bring the Housing Element into conformance with State Housing Element Law while maintaining conformance with the General Plan. As noted in the Project Description, the proposed amendments to the Housing Element do not call for any development that would exceed the amounts (i.e. numbers of dwelling units) and rates (number of acres or dwelling units developed per year) set forth in the December 2003 General Plan as amended.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

XI. 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? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE: Would 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? (Source: 1) Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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? (Sources: 1, 4) Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XIII. 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)? (Source: 1) Discussion: As noted in the Project Description, the proposed 2011 Housing Element Update does not call for any development that would exceed the amounts (i.e. numbers of dwelling units) and rates (number of acres or dwelling units developed per year) set forth in the December 2003 General Plan as amended.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? Discussion:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The purpose of the Housing Element is to facilitate the development of affordable housing.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would 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? (Sources: 1,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
c. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
d. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

XV. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to a level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:				
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion:				

Potentially
Significant
Impact

Less Than
Significant with
Mitigation
Incorporated

Less Than
Significant
Impact

No
Impact

XVIII. 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?

☐☐☐☒

Discussion:

- 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 projects)?

☐☐☐☒

Discussion:

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

☐☐☐☒

Discussion:

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	Same as above
3	City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update	Same as above
4	2005 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles Urban Water Management Plan 2005	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
10	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
11	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
12	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
13	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446

Paso Robles Housing Element

May 11, 2011 Conversation Follow up Checklist

The following is organized based on the May 11 telephone conversation. The purpose of this document is to provide technical assistance to address remaining statutory requirements based on our preliminary review. In some cases, actual language/revision is offered for consideration in blue using the April 2011 version of the housing element. The outline (A1, A2, etc) is based on the July 16, 2009 HCD review letter and relevant page numbers are indicated in parentheses.

A3 – Progress in Meeting the RHNA (H-52 and Appendix D)

The element could indicate how units are affordable to lower income households (e.g., financing mechanisms, actual rents or sales prices). Here is a sample table:

UNITS BUILT, UNDER CONSTRUCTION AND/OR APPROVED							
Project Name	Status Built Under Construction Approved	Total Units	Units by Income Level				Methodology of Affordability Determination (1) Sales price (2) Rent price (3) Type of Subsidy
			VL	L	M	AM	

City Response: *Appendix D-1 was revised to use this format and provide the affordability determination information.*

A3 – Emergency Shelters (H-47)

The element should provide additional information to describe the appropriateness of the PM zones for emergency shelters relative to environmental conditions (e.g., noxious fumes, dust, etc): The element could discuss allowable uses to facilitate this information.

City Response: *The discussion of the PM Zone on Page H-47 was revised to provide the requested information.*

HCD Comments on April 2011 Draft Housing Element

A4 – Land Use Controls (H-67 – H-70; Appendix M-1 – M-4)

The following is a sample table to capture all development standards, particularly the remaining residential zones not described.

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS										
Zone District	Bldg Height	Lot Width	Minimum Yard Setback				Minimum Lot Area (sq. ft.)	Lot Area Per DU (sq. ft.)	Parking Spaces Per DU	Minimum Open Space (sq. ft.)
			Front	Side	Rear	Front				

City Response: *The headings in Appendix N (formerly Appendix M) were revised to clarify that all zoning districts have been analyzed.*

A4 – Permit Processing and Procedures (Appendix N and H-71 – H-73)

The following are sample tables to show permit types for residential uses by zone and typical timelines:

HOUSING TYPES PERMITTED BY ZONING DISTRICT				
RESIDENTIAL USE	ZONE			
	R-1*	R-2*	R-3*	Mixed-Use*
SF-Detached				
SF-Attached				
2-4 DU				
5+ DU				
Residential Care < 6P				
Residential Care < 6P				
Emergency Shelter				
Single-Room Occupancy				
Manufactured Homes				
Mobile-Homes				

HCD Comments on April 2011 Draft Housing Element

Transitional Housing				
Farmworker Housing				
Supportive Housing				
Farmworker Housing				
2nd Unit				
P=Permitted CUP=Conditional Use * Change zoning designations to match jurisdiction's zoning ordinance as appropriate.				

City Response: *A new Appendix M was created to provide the requested information. Additionally, a new paragraph to introduce this topic was added to Page H-67 to read as follows:*

i. Permitted and Conditional Uses. The Zoning Code establishes which types of residential uses are permitted in the various zoning districts. Some types of residential uses require approval of a conditional use permit; these include residential care facilities for more than 6 persons, mobile home parks, and more than 2 units per lot in the Office Professional Zone. Appendix M contains a list of housing types permitted in each zoning district.

TIMELINES FOR PERMIT PROCEDURES	
Type of Approval or Permit	Typical Processing Time
Ministerial Review	
Conditional Use Permit	
Zone Change	
General Plan Amendment	
Site Plan Review	
Architectural/Design Review	
Tract Maps	
Parcel Maps	
Initial Environmental Study	
Environmental Impact Report	
Other	
Source: Local Building and Planning Departments	

City Response: *Table H-29 on Page H-72 was revised to provide the requested information..*

B1 – Emergency Shelters and Transitional and Supportive Housing: Formerly Program 3, Now Program 9 (H-13)

The following is some suggested revisions for consideration:

- 9 Adopt an ordinance to implement SB 2 (Statutes of 2007) to provide that emergency shelters may be permitted by right *(without a CUP or other discretionary action) in the XXX and/or YY zoning districts* that has sufficient capacity to meet the City's need for homeless housing and which is located close to transit stops and services. *Emergency shelters shall be only subject to the same development and management standards that apply to other allowed uses within the proposed zone(s).*

This ordinance shall also provide that transitional and supportive housing *are a residential use subject to only those restrictions that apply to other residential uses of the same type in the same zone.* ~~permitted by right in residential zoning districts.~~ Target Date: December 31, 2011.

City Response: *Action 9 on Page H-13 was revised to provide the requested information.*

B2 – Extremely Low Income Households: Program 16 (H-14)

The following is some suggested revisions for consideration:

- 16 Give top priority for use of Redevelopment Low and Moderate Income Housing (LMIH) Funds to the redevelopment of Oak Park Public Housing, particularly Phase One (build 69 new units of which 39 will replace deteriorating existing units) and fully support applications for Federal HOME funds for this project. *As part of this effort, the City will also give top priority for the housing for extremely low-income households.* Target Date: Fiscal Year 11/12.

City Response: *Action 16 on Page H-14 was revised to provide the requested information.*

B2 – Special Needs: Program 6 (H-12)

The following is some suggested revisions for consideration:

- 6 Work with developers to increase the supply of new housing for all income groups and special needs throughout the City. Examples would include: prioritizing staff time to process permits for units affordable to lower income households; providing technical assistance in applying for government financing (e.g., LMIH and HOME funds); *concessions and incentives*, using LMIH funds to offset City development fees; providing preliminary staff review of development proposals at no cost to developers. *The City shall at least annually meet with developers*

HCD Comments on April 2011 Draft Housing Element

and/or other stakeholders and seek funding at least twice in the planning period. As part of this effort, the City shall also consider prioritizing local financial resources and at least bi-annually seek and apply for State and Federal funding specifically targeted for the development of housing affordable to extremely low-income households.

City Response: *Action 6 on Page H-12 was revised to provide the requested information.*

B5 – At-risk: Program 12 (H-15)

The following is some suggested revisions for consideration:

- 12 Provide technical assistance to owners and non-profit housing corporation buyers of existing subsidized low income housing complexes that are at risk of conversion to market rate to extend subsidy contracts and/or find government financing (e.g., HOME funds) for acquisition and rehabilitation, *including the following:*
 - *Monitor Units At-Risk*
 - *Work with Potential Purchasers - Establish contact with public and non-profit agencies interested in purchasing and/or managing units at-risk to inform them of the status of such projects. Where feasible, provide technical assistance and support to these organizations with respect to financing.*
 - *Tenant Education - The City will work with tenants of at-risk units and provide them with education regarding tenant rights and conversion procedures. The City will also provide tenants in at-risk projects information regarding Section 8 rent subsidies through the Housing Authority, and other affordable housing opportunities in the City.*

City Response: *Action 12 on Page H-13 was revised to provide the requested information.*

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

LEGAL NEWSPAPER NOTICE

PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY
PROJECT NOTICINGNewspaper: TribuneDate of
Publication: June 1, 2011Hearing
Date: June 21, 2011
(City Council)Project: Notice of Intent to Adopt a Negative
Declaration (2011 Update of the Housing
Element of the General PlanCITY OF PASO ROBLES
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION2011 UPDATE OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT
OF THE GENERAL PLAN

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles will hold a Public Hearing on Tuesday, June 21, 2011, to consider approving the 2011 Update of the Housing Element of the General Plan and adopt a Negative Declaration for this project. The public hearing will be held at 7:30 p.m. in the Library Conference Center/City Council Chambers at Paso de Robles Library/City Hall, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California.

The Public Review Period for the proposed Negative Declaration commenced on May 13, 2011, and will end on June 21, 2011 at the City Council hearing for this matter.

All interested persons may attend this public hearing and be heard on this matter.

At its meeting of May 24, 2011, the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles held a Public Hearing on the 2011 Update of the Housing Element and, on a 5-0-2 vote, recommended that the City Council adopt the draft document as presented.

The City of Paso Robles has reviewed the above project in accordance with the City of Paso Robles' Rules and Procedures for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act and has made a preliminary determination that an Environmental Impact Report need not be prepared because the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

The Initial Study which provides the basis for this determination is available at the City of Paso Robles, Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446.

The public is invited to provide written comment on the 2011 Update of the Housing Element and the Draft Negative Declaration and to provide oral comment at the public hearing noted above. The appropriateness of the Draft Negative Declaration will be reconsidered in light of the comments received.

A draft copy of the 2011 Update of the Housing Element is posted on the City's web site at <http://www.prcity.com/government/departments/commdev/housing/housing-element.asp>. Copies of the draft have also been placed in the City Library at 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles. Copies may also be purchased at the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446 for the cost of reproduction.


Written comments on the proposed project may be mailed to the Community Development Department, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446 or emailed to ed@prcity.com, provided that the comments are received prior to the time of the public hearing. Oral comments may be made at the hearing. Should you have any questions regarding this application, please contact Ed Gallagher, City Planner, at (805) 237-3970 or via email to ed@prcity.com.

If you challenge the Housing Element in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearings described in this notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing.

Ed Gallagher, City Planner
June 1, 2011

6943807

I, Theresa Variano, employee of the Community Development Department, Planning Division, of the City of El Paso de Robles, do hereby certify that this notice is a true copy of a published legal newspaper notice for the above named project.

Signed: 
Theresa Variano

forms/newsaffi.691