RESOLUTION NO. 07-058

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES GRANTING NEGATIVE DECLARATION STATUS FOR DEMOLITION OF A PORTION OF A RESIDENTIAL HOUSE AND A DETACHED GARAGE AT 1337 VINE STREET (DEMOLITION 07-001 - APPLICANT: BRUCE WHITE)

WHEREAS, pursuant to Chapter 17.16 (Demolition of Buildings and Structures) of the Zoning Ordinance, the City Council is being asked to make a determination as to whether or not the building is of historic or architectural significance, and to authorize a demolition permit; and

WHEREAS, Demo 07-001 is proposing to demolish the following buildings or portions buildings:

- An approximate 560 square foot addition to the existing residence (Bldg. A). The addition is at the rear of the original house and was added after the original house was built;
- The 440 square foot detached garage;
- The existing barn building at the rear of the site (Bldg. B).

WHEREAS, Building B is not discussed in the inventory and is clearly not historic; and

WHEREAS, consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study has been prepared and the required notice has been published regarding consideration of a Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study (Exhibit A attached) was prepared for this project; and

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

WHEREAS, the Council has the discretion to make a final determination as to the subject building's historic or architectural significance or non significance prior to the processing of the demolition permit; and

WHEREAS, although the subject buildings (or portions there of) are in the City's Historic Resources Inventory, they are not on any local or State Register of historic structures; and

WHEREAS, although not specifically listed, state law will still require analysis and a determination of historic significance prior to City Council authorizing demolition; and

WHEREAS, a letter was submitted by Grace Pucci along with Norma Moye and Barbara Rowland, discussing the history of the house and concluding that the proposed demolition would not have architectural or historical significance since the buildings proposed for removal were constructed at a later date and the original house would be preserved; and

WHEREAS, based on the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project 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 application was approved.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that based on the City Council's independent judgment, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby approve a Negative Declaration in conjunction with determining that the subject portion of the house being removed (Building A) along with the detached garage, and the detached barn at the rear of the property (Building B), are not of architectural significance and that it would be appropriate to process a demolition permit for the structures, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 3rd day of April 2007 by the following vote:

AYES: Hamon, Picanco, Strong and Nemeth
NOES:
ABSTAIN: Mecham
ABSENT:

_____
Gary N. Nemeth, Mayor Pro Tem

ATTEST:

_____
Deborah Robinson, Deputy City Clerk

CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, California 93446

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

In accordance with the policies regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, this document, combined with the attached supporting data, constitutes the initial study on the subject project. This initial study provides the basis for the determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If it is determined that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report will be prepared which focuses on the areas of concern identified by this initial study.

1.	Project Title:	Demolition 07-001 (Bruce White)
2.	Lead Agency Name and Address:	*City of El Paso de Robles, 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, California 93446*
3.	Contact Person and Phone Number:	Darren Nash, (805) 237-3970
4.	Project Location:	1337 Vine Street
5.	Project Sponsor's Name and Address:	same as above
6.	General Plan Designation:	Residential Multi-Family, Office Professional Overlay (RMF-8, OP Overlay District)
7.	Zoning:	R2-OP (Residential Multi-Family, Office Professional Overlay)
8.	Description of Project:	For the City Council to consider an application filed by Ken Nagahara on behalf of Bruce white to authorize a demolition permit for the following buildings: • An approximate 560 square foot addition to the existing residence (Bldg. A). The addition is at the rear of the original house and was added after the original house was built; • The 440 square foot detached garage; • The existing barn building at the rear of the site (Bldg. B).

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Office Professional/OP Overlay, R2 on all sides

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: None

Related Information: The City's Historic Resources Inventory reflects the portion of Building A, and the detached garage in the data sheets as accessory to the main house. The main house (Building A) is not on any local, State or Federal register. The inventory does not mention Building B.

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.

[ ]	Land Use and Planning	[ ]	Transportation/Circulation	[ ]	Public Services
[ ]	Population and Housing	[ ]	Biological Resources	[ ]	Utilities and Service Systems
[ ]	Geological Problems	[ ]	Hazards	[x]	Aesthetics
[ ]	Water	[ ]	Noise	[x]	Cultural Resources
[ ]	Air Quality	[ ]	Energy and Mineral Resources	[ ]	Recreation
		[ ]	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

DETERMINATION

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 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 significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect I) 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, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or " potentially significant unless mitigated." 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, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. [ ]

Signature Date

Printed Name For

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal:				
a)	Conflict with general plan designation or zoning	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b)	Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c)	Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
d)	Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e)	Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
	Demolition of the existing buildings and replacement with confirming structure would be consistent with the General Plan, Zoning, and the land use patterns of the immediate area.				
II.	POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:				
a)	Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b)	Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c)	Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
III.	GEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
a)	Fault rupture?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b)	Seismic ground shaking?	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
c)	Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d)	Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e)	Landslides or mudflows?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
f)	Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
g)	Subsidence of the land?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
h)	Expansive soils?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
i)	Unique geologic or physical features?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

The December 22, 2003 San Simeon earthquake subjected the area to ground shaking. Current building code requirements should provide adequate mitigation for new structures on the property. Demolition of the existing structures and replacement with code compliant structures would be a public safety asset.

IV.	WATER. Would the proposal result in:				
a)	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff!	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b)	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c)	Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d)	Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e)	Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
f)	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capacity?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
g)	Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
h)	Impacts to groundwater quality?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
i)	Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
The demolition permit will be processed through the Building Department as well as be reviewed by APCD to get necessary permits prior to demo.	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?				
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d) Create objectionable odors?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:

a)	Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b)	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c)	Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d)	Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e)	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
f)	Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
g)	Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:				
a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b) Locally designated species (e.g. heritage trees)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d) Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve				
a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: Oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
NOISE. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Increases in existing noise levels?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:				
a) Fire protection?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b) Police protection?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c) Schools?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e) Other governmental services?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:				
a) Power or natural gas?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b) Communications systems?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d) Sewer or septic tanks?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e) Storm water drainage?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
f) Solid waste disposal?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
g) Local or regional water supplies?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:				
a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
c) Create light or glare?	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]

Replacement of structures that have been at the subject location for many decades is anticipated to raise concerns regarding aesthetic impacts. New construction would be per current standards.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a) Disturb paleontological resources?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b) Disturb archaeological resources?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c) Affect historical resources?	[ ]	[ ]	[X]	[ ]
d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

A letter was submitted by Grace Pucci along with Norma Moye and Barbara Rowland, discussing the history of the house and concluding that the proposed demolition would not have architectural or historical significance since the buildings proposed for removal were constructed at a later date and the original house would be preserved. Attached as Exhibit A to this Initial Study.

Since the main House Building A is listed in the City's Historic Resources Inventory and the subject addition to Building A and the detached garage are identified in the fact sheets of the inventory, its demolition may raise public concerns. The structure is not on any adopted State or Local Register of Historic Places. Building A will be preserved.

XV. RECREATION. Would the proposal:				
a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitats 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?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
c) 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)	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	[ ]	[ ]	[ ]	[X]

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.
Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080. 1, 21080.3, 2!082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino,
202 Gal. App. 3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Gal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).