RESOLUTION 15-144
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
RZ 15-003, PD 15-006, PR 15-0058, OTR 15-006
(TRI-WEST DEVELOPMENT, INC.)

WHEREAS, North Coast Engineering, on behalf of Tri-West Development, Inc. has filed for the following applications:

a. **Rezone 15-003:** add Planned Development (PD) Overlay zoning over the existing R-1 zone to allow for flexibility in lot size and building setbacks;

b. **PD 15-006**: request modifications from the R1-B3 zoning requirements to allow for lots to be less than the 20,000 square foot minimum, lot widths less than 100 feet, and allow reduced side yard setbacks from 10-feet on each side to 10 feet on one side, and 5 feet on the other side;

c. **Vesting Tentative Parcel Map PR 15-0058**: request to subdivide a 1.94 acre lot into four lots ranging in size from 31,620 square feet to 14,996 square feet;

d. **Oak Tree Removal 15-006:** request to remove 2 native white oak trees (one 11-inch and one 13-inch);

and;

WHEREAS, the property is located at 2025 Union Road; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (attached as Exhibit A), which concludes that the project as proposed will not have significant impacts on the environment; and

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

WHEREAS, the circulation period for the Negative Declaration is October 16, 2005 to December 1, 2015, the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project, concludes that there is no substantial evidence that this project would have significant adverse effects on the environment and recommends that the City Council approve the Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, on October 27, 2015, The Planning Commission recommended that the City Council approve the Negative Declaration, Rezone, Planned Development, Vesting Tentative Tract Map, and the removal of the two oak trees, subject to conditions of approval; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the City Council on December 1, 2015 to consider the Initial Study prepared for this application, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed environmental determination for the proposed zoning modification; and

WHEREAS, based on General Plan Land Use Designation, the 2003 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this zoning modification, the staff report and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the City Council finds be made that there is no substantial evidence that the project would have a significant impact on the environment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the above Recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

2. That based on the City's independent judgment, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles approves a Negative Declaration for Rezone 15-003, Vesting Tentative Parcel Map PR 15-0058, PD 15-002 and OTR 15-006, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles this 1st day of December 2015 by the following vote:

AYES: Gregory, Hamon, Reed, Strong, Martin
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Steven W. Martin, Mayor

ATTEST:

Kristen L. Buxkemper, Deputy City Clerk

EXHIBIT A

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF PASO ROBLES

1.	**PROJECT TITLE:**	**Tri-West Parcel Map**
	Concurrent Entitlements:	**Vesting Tentative Parcel Map PR 15-0058, Rezone 15-003, and Oak Tree Removal OTR 15-006**
2.	**LEAD AGENCY:**	City of Paso Robles 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
	Contact:	
	Phone:	(805) 237-3970
	Email:	
3.	**PROJECT LOCATION:**	2025 Union Road
4.	**PROJECT PROPONENT:**	**North Coast Engineering**
	Contact Person:	**Larry Werner (Representative)**
	Phone:	**(805) 239-3127**
	Email:	lwerner@northcoastengineering.com
5.	**GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:**	**RSF-2 (Res Single Family, 2 units/acre)**
6.	**ZONING:**	**R1-B3 (Res Single Family, 20,000sf lots)**

7. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Request to subdivide a 1.94 acre lot into four lots ranging in size from 33,000 square feet to 17,000 square feet and add Planned Development (PD) Overlay zoning over the existing R1-B3 zone to allow for flexibility in lot size and building setbacks. The project will include the removal of 2 native white oak trees (one 11-inch and one 13-inch).

Lot Sizes: by applying PD Overlay over the property which would result in a zoning designation of R1-B3 PD, would allow for the ability to have lots less than the 20,000 square foot minimum. The applicants are proposing that Lot 1, which is adjacent to Union Road, be 32,000 sf to allow for the proposed single family home to be placed further back from the road, which would allow additional buffer from the road way, as well as utilize the flatter portion of the lot to place the home. By providing a larger lot for Lot 1, there would be the need to reduce the size of lots 2-4 to less than 20,000sf (Lot 2: 19,000 - Lot 3: 19,000 and Lot 4: 14,500).

Setbacks: The Zoning Code requires interior side setbacks for lots within the R1-B3 zone to have a minimum of 10-feet. The applicants are requesting the ability to have one side be 5-feet and the other side yard setback to be 10-feet, similar to the setback requirements for a standard R-1 zone. The 5-foot reduction would allow the ability to place a wider home on the lots.

Oak Trees: There are two oak trees located along Union Road. The applicants are requesting that the trees be removed to allow for the curb, gutter, and sidewalk to be located adjacent to Union Road. In order for the oak trees to remain, the alignment of the curb, gutter, and sidewalk would need to be designed in a manner that it meanderers around the oak trees and because of topographic challengers, the redesign of a portion of the existing sidewalk to the west may be necessary. While this environmental review will acknowledge the removal of the oak trees, it will be up to the City Council to decide if the trees warrant removal. If the Council does not approve removal, the curb, gutter, and sidewalk would be required to be installed in a manner that protects the oak trees.

8. **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:** there is an existing single family home located on the site along with multiple accessory buildings (shed and carport). Besides the foot print of the structures and the paved access driveway, the majority of the site is left natural. A small portion of the lot frontage along Union Road slopes to the north, otherwise the majority of site is relatively flat. Besides the two oak trees mentioned above, the site is covered with native grasses and landscape shrubs and trees planted by previous residents. The perimeter of the site is fenced with residential style fencing.

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.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology /Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic	☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ 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: _____ Date 10/16/15

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Discussion: The project site is not located within a scenic vista.				
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Discussion: The site is not considered a scenic resource and is not located along a state scenic highway, and there are no historic buildings located on this site.				
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Discussion: A single family residence currently exists on the site. The request is to subdivide the parcel into four lots for the construction of four new homes. The homes along with the new lots would be consistent with the type of home and lot size that currently exists for the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Since the homes and lots that would be developed would be similar to those in the area, impacts to visual character and quality would be less than significant.				
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)	☐	☐	☐	☒
Discussion: Any new exterior lighting will be required to be shielded so that it does not produce off-site glare.				

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Discussion: The project is not located on agriculturally zoned land and there are no agricultural activities taking place on the site.				
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Discussion: See discussion section for Section II.a.				

	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))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Discussion: The project is not located on agriculturally zoned land and there are no agricultural activities taking place on the site.				
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Discussion: The project is not located on land zoned for forest purposes.				
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Discussion: This project would not result in the conversion of farmland or forest land.				

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)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11)	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)	☐	☐	☐	☒

	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 (a-d) besides the short term impacts from the demolition of the existing house and the grading necessary for the development of each lot. The contractor will be required to get clearance from the APCD prior to receiving a demolition permit, and follow the standard dust control measures related to grading. The impacts to air quality created by the subdivision of the land and the construction of four homes would be less than significant.

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: the subdivision of the land and the construction of four single family homes will not create impacts to this environmental factor.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 (a-d): since the site does not provide for habitat, or have riparian habitat, wetlands, or contain wildlife corridors, the subdivision of the land and the construction of four single family homes will not create impacts to these environmental factors.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion (e): there are two oak trees located on the site, adjacent to Union Road. The applicants are requesting that the trees be removed to allow for the construction of curb, gutter, and sidewalk to be located adjacent to Union Road. In order for the oak trees to remain, the alignment of the curb, gutter, and sidewalk would need to be designed in a manner that meanderers around the oak trees. While this environmental review will acknowledge the removal of the oak trees, it will be up to the City Council to decide if the trees warrant removal. If the Council does not approve removal, the curb, gutter, and sidewalk would be required to be installed in a manner that protects the oak trees.

The City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance provides a process for property owners to apply for removing oak trees. The review and approval of oak tree removals associated with new development requires approval by the City Council. The two oak trees on this site will either be allowed to be removed by the City Council, or required to be protected, therefore conflicts related to the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance is less than significant.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion (a-f):

There are no conservation plans associated with this parcel.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion (a-d):

There are no historic resources located on this site. Given the location and size of this parcel and since it is surrounded by existing residential development, it is not anticipated that there will be any cultural impacts with the development of this site.

In the event that buried or otherwise unknown cultural resources are discovered during construction work in the area of the find, work shall be suspended and the City of Paso Robles should be contacted immediately,

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

and appropriate mitigations measures shall be developed by qualified archeologist or historian if necessary, at the developers expense.

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)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The potential for and mitigation of impacts that may result from fault rupture in the project area are identified and addressed in the General Plan EIR, pg. 4.5-8. There are two known fault zones on either side of the Salinas Rivers valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley, and grazes the City on its western boundary. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and is situated about 30 miles east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the Uniform Building Code to all new development within the City. Review of available information and examinations indicate that neither of these faults is active with respect to ground rupture in Paso Robles. Soils and geotechnical reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standard conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within City limits.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: The proposed project will be constructed to current CBC codes. The General Plan EIR identified impacts resulting from ground shaking as less than significant and provided mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the design of this project including adequate structural design and not constructing over active or potentially active faults.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is located in an area with soil conditions that have a potential for liquefaction or other type of ground failure due to seismic events and soil conditions. To implement the EIR's mitigation measures to reduce this potential impact, the City has a standard condition to require submittal of soils and geotechnical reports, which include site-specific analysis of liquefaction potential for all building permits for new construction, and incorporation of the recommendations of said reports into the design of the project

iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion: See discussions above.				
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)	☐	☐	☒	☐
Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR the soil condition is not erosive or otherwise unstable. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated. A geotechnical/ soils analysis will be required prior to issuance of building permits that will evaluate the site specific soil stability and suitability of grading and retaining walls proposed. This study will determine the necessary grading techniques that will ensure that potential impacts due to soil stability will not occur. An erosion control plan shall be required to be approved by the City Engineer prior to commencement of site grading.				
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: See response to item a.iii, above.				
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: See response to item a.iii, above.				
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: The future development of homes on the parcels would be required to be hooked up to the City's sanitary sewer system, therefore there is no impact.				

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion (a-b): Since the proposed subdivision would comply with General Plan and Zoning regulations, impacts as a result of greenhouse gas emissions will be less than significant.

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

Discussion (a-d): The development of the four lot parcel map for single family residential use would not create a hazard, or use/produce hazardous materials.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion (e): The project is not located with the airport influence area, therefore this project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing in the area.

	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 (f): There are no know private air strips in the vicinity of the project site, therefore there is no impact.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 (g,h):

The development of the subdivision will not expose people to wildland fires, and is not adjacent to wildlands, therefore there will not be an impact.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)	☐	☐	☒	☐
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-	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
site? (Source: 10)				
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)	☐	☐	☒	☐
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)	☐	☐	☒	☐
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j. Inundation by mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒
k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
l. Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Discussion (a-l): The subdivision of the 1.94 acre lot into four parcels for the development of single family homes is consistent with the City General Plan and Zoning regulations. The project will be required to hook up to City water and sewer. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the City Engineering Department will review the plans to insure that all the necessary requirements for compliance with City codes related to grading, drainage and storm water are provided, therefore there are no impacts from this project on hydrology and water quality.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: the 1.94 acre site is surrounded by existing residential development, and subdividing the parcel into four parcels for single family homes would be consistent with the surrounding residential neighborhoods, and would not divide an established community, therefore there is no impact.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion:

The development of this 1.9 acre site into four lots for single family development is consistent with the R1-B3 zoning and RSF-4 land use designations. The request to add PD Overlay zoning over the site is to allow for the lot sizes to be below the 20,000 square foot threshold that the R1-B3 zoning requires. For this project the reduction in lot size would provide for the lots to be 14,995, 19,004, 19,015 and 31,620. The residential lots in the area are typically an average of 10,000 square feet. Based on the project complying with the General Plan and Zoning requirements, and that the proposed PD Overlay zoning would allow for the lots to be reduced in a manner that would be larger than the typical single family zoned lots in the area, impacts from this project on Land Use and Planning would be less than significant.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans established in this area of the City. Therefore there is no impact.

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)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	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? (Source: 1)	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.

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: A single family residence currently exists on the site. The request is to subdivide the parcel into four lots for the construction of four new homes. The homes along with the new lots would be consistent with the type of home and lot size that currently exists for the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Since the homes and lots that would be developed would be similar to those in the area, there would not be impacts to noise as a result of this project.

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: There may be temporary vibrations related to the grading and compaction of the site in preparation for construction. The construction phase of the project will be required to comply with the City's noise level requirements, including hours of construction activity, and as a result of these standard construction requirements, impacts from vibrations as a result of construction activity will be less than significant.

c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: See section XIIa

d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion: See section XIIb

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

(Sources: 1, 4)

Discussion: The project is not located in an Airport influence area.

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)	☐	☐	☐	☒
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion (a-c):

A single family residence currently exists on the site. The request is to subdivide the parcel into four lots for the construction of four new homes complies with the densities established by the land use and zoning regulations, therefore this project would not have an impact on population and 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)	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10)	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion (a-e):

A single family residence currently exists on the site. The request is to subdivide the parcel into four lots for the construction of four new homes complies with the densities established by the land use and zoning regulations, therefore impacts related to public services would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Discussion (a&b):				
The project will not impact recreational facilities.				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures or 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion (a-f):

A single family residence currently exists on the site. The request is to subdivide the parcel into four lots for the construction of four new homes. The homes along with the new lots would be consistent with the type of home and lot size that currently exists for the surrounding residential neighborhoods and consistent with the current City land use and zoning requirements. Since the proposed project would comply with the land use and zoning requirements, it is consistent with the City's Circulation Element, and therefore this project impacts on traffic and circulations would be less than significant.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion (a-g):

A single family residence currently exists on the site. The request is to subdivide the parcel into four lots for the construction of four new homes. The homes along with the new lots would be consistent with the type of home and lot size that currently exists for the surrounding residential neighborhoods and consistent with the current City land use and zoning requirements. Since the proposed project would comply with the land use and zoning requirements, it is consistent with the City's General Plan, and therefore this project impacts on utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

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: The 1.9 acre site is surrounded by development on all sides, except for an approximate 2 acre lot adjacent to the east. Based on the relatively small lot size, and that there is no visual evidence of fish or wildlife habitat, it is anticipated that this projects impact on fish, wildlife or plants is less than significant.

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: The request is to subdivide the parcel into four lots for the construction of four new homes. The homes along with the new lots would be consistent with the type of home and lot size that currently exists for the surrounding residential neighborhoods and consistent with the current City land use and zoning requirements. Since the proposed project would comply with the land use and zoning requirements, it is consistent with the City's General Plan, and therefore the project would not have impacts that would be considered individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion: Since the proposed project would comply with the land use and zoning requirements, and is consistent with the City's General Plan, there would not be an adverse effect on human beings.

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

Reference #	Document Title	Available for Review at:
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