

RESOLUTION NO.: 04-069

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES  
APPROVING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR  
TENTATIVE MAP APPROVAL FOR PR 04-0053 AND AN AMENDMENT TO  
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 91002 / 91003  
(PISCIOTTA)

APN: 009-750-012

WHEREAS, Tentative Parcel Map PR 04-0053 has been filed by McCarthy Engineering on behalf of Charles Pisciotta proposal to subdivide an approximate 1.9 acre site into four lots for three new single family dwelling and one existing single family dwelling at 725 Oriole Way; and

WHEREAS, this parcel is located within a planned development (PD) zoning overlay district and this application is located within the geographic area covered by a master development PD 91002 / 91003; and

WHEREAS, subdivision of this property requires an amendment to Planned Development PD 91002 / 91003; and

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held by the Planning Commission on May 11, 2004 to consider the proposed project, at which time no decision was made and the hearing was continued to the June 8, 2004 Planning Commission meeting ; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on June 8, 2004 to consider the Initial Study on file with the Community Development Departments and prepared for this application, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed environmental determination, 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 Planning Commission finds no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, if the application was approved with conditions as described in that initial study and contained in the resolutions approving PR 04-0053 and amendment to Planned Development PD 91002 / 91003.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, that the Mitigated Negative Declaration

provided in Exhibit A is hereby approved for PR 04-0053 and an amendment to Planned Development PD 91002 / 91003 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 8<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2004 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Steinbeck, Mattke, Kemper, Johnson, Hamon, Flynn, Ferravanti

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

---

CHAIRMAN TOM FLYNN

ATTEST:

---

ROBERT A. LATA, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

**EXHIBIT A OF RESOLUTION 04-\_\_\_\_**  
**Mitigated Negative Declaration Prepared for PR 04-0053**

**ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST  
FORM  
CITY OF PASO ROBLES  
PLANNING DIVISION**

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** PR 04-0053/Amendment to PD 91002 /91003  
**Concurrent Entitlements:** None
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles  
1000 Spring Street  
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Jamie Kirk, Kirk Consulting, Contract  
Planner  
**Phone:** (805) 461-5765
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** 725 Oriole Way  
(APN 009-750-012)
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Charles M. Pisciotta / McCarthy  
Engineering
- Contact Person:** John McCarthy  
**Phone:** (805) 239-9585
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Residential Single-Family, two units per  
acre (RSF-2)
- 6. ZONING:** R1,B3, PD, Single Family Residential,  
20,000 S.F. minimum lot size

**7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Proposal to amend Planned Development 91003/91002 to allow the subdivision of a 1.9-acre parcel into four single-family residential lots of approximately 20,000 square feet each.

**8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

The site is developed with a single family dwelling, several accessory structures, and related site improvements. The project will be served by city water and sewer. There is one large oak tree located on the site and several pine trees. The site is surrounded by residential development.

**Neighboring Properties:**

**North:** existing 20,000 square-foot residential parcels, **South:** existing large lot residential +/-2 acres, **West:** existing +/- 25,000 – 30,000 square-foot single family residential parcels, **East:** existing +/- 7,500 square-foot single family residential parcels. All neighboring sites are under the same general plan and zoning designation.

**9. RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:**

**10. PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN THE PREPARATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY:**

**Jamie Kirk: Principal Planner, Kirk Consulting, John Falkenstien: City Engineer.**

**11. CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR PROJECT:**

This environmental initial study will study the associated impacts that may occur with the subdivision of one existing parcel of a total of 1.90 acres into four single family residential lots of approximately 20,000 square feet each.

**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” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources       | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems  | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy & Mineral Resources            | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water                | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                  |
|   | <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 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 one or more effects (1) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) have been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or is “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effect(s) that remain to be addressed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Jamie Kirk  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name

Principal 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 the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
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. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.
4. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” 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). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVII at the end of the checklist.
6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.
7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix I of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the needs and requirements of the City of Paso Robles.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers’ information, a list of applicable standard conditions identified in the discussions has been provided as an attachment to this document.)

*SAMPLE QUESTION:*

<i>ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<i>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts</i>					

*involving:*

*Landslides or Mud flows? (Sources: 1, 6)*



*Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Paso Robles General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).*

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? (Source: 1,2)

Discussion: The proposed subdivision is consistent with the City's Zoning Code and General Plan designation.

- b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Discussion: There are no other environmental plans or policies by other agencies besides the City of Paso Robles.

- c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? (Source: 1,2)

Discussion: The proposed use is compatible with the surrounding single family residential uses. The site is surrounded by properties with the same zoning designation.

- d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible uses)?

Discussion: The project site is zoned for residential purposes and the development of the subject project would not have an impact on agricultural resources.

- e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

Discussion: N/A

**II. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the proposal:

- a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? (Source: Paso Robles General Plan.)

Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with the density allowed within the current General Plan and Zoning designations. Therefore, there is no impact on population projections.

- b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?

Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with the densities allowed in the General Plan and the infrastructure already exists. The site is surrounded by similar development and would not be considered growth inducing. Therefore, there is no impact on growth projections.

- c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Discussion: There is one existing house on the site that will be preserved.

**III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS.** Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

- a) Fault rupture?



ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	Potentially Significant No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

Discussion: This portion of San Luis Obispo County (generally the Paso Robles area) is located at the far southerly end of the Salinas Valley which also extends up into Monterey County. There are two known fault zones on either side of this valley. The San Marco-Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and runs through the community of Parkfield 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. Soils reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standardly applied conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant.

- b) Seismic ground shaking?

Discussion: See the response to Section III(a). Based on that response, the potential for exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant.

- c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?

Discussion: The City's General Plan contains public safety policies that would require special attention to projects with potential for liquefaction. Also, see the response to Section III(a). Based on the above discussion, the potential for exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards, including liquefaction is not considered significant.

- d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?

Discussion: The project site is not located in an area identified at risk for seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazards.

- e) Landslides or Mud flows?

Discussion: See discussion for III (f).

- f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?

Discussion: See the discussion in Section III(a). In addition to standard erosion control measures being part of a future development, all grading would be subject to standard conditions of approval ensuring that soils conditions are suitable for the proposed structures and improvements. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated.

- g) Subsidence of the land?

Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (a) and (f) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

- h) Expansive soils?

Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (a) and (f) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

- i) Unique geologic or physical features?

Discussion: N/A

**IV. WATER.** Would the proposal result in:

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Source: 6,9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: It is a standard condition that the developer mitigates additional storm drain run-off generated by their project. Appropriate drainage facilities shall be designed in accordance with current City Standards, and design plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.				
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: All development will be located outside of a 100 year flood area.				
c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See Sec. IV a, discussion				
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
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 capability?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				

**V. AIR QUALITY.** Would the proposal:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The San Luis Obispo County area is a non-attainment area for the State standards for ozone and suspended particulate matter. The SLO County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) administers a permit system to ensure that stationary sources do not collectively create emissions which would cause local and state standards to be exceeded. The

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

potential for future project development to create adverse air quality impacts falls generally into two categories: Short term and Long term impacts.

Short term impacts are associated with the grading and development portion of a project where earth work generates dust, but the impact ends when construction is complete. Long term impacts are related to the ongoing operational characteristics of a project and are generally related to vehicular trip generation and the level of offensiveness of the onsite activity being developed.

The operational phase impacts will likely be less than the District's CEQA mitigation threshold value of 10 lbs of emissions per day.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature? (Source: 10,13) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Create objectionable odors? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

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

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed project is consistent with the current General Plan and Zoning designations. The traffic trips allowed in the land use designations were evaluated in the EIR prepared for the General Plan. There are no anticipated impacts to traffic trips or congestion. Oriole Way and Larksfield Place are designed to accommodate the additional 30 ADT's (average daily trips) that will be generated by the project, furthermore, the project will be required to do frontage improvements along Oriole Way and Larksfield Place.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Hazards to safety from design features (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: N/A

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses? (Source: 16) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Emergency Services has reviewed the project and had a concern regarding the length of the access drive to parcel three. There is not an interior fire hydrant and the closest fire hydrant is located on Larksfield Place approximately 300 feet from the proposed building site.

**Mitigation:** An approved fire department turnaround will be required to be installed on parcel 3. Additionally the future residence on parcel three will be required to be equipped with residential fire sprinklers.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: Each house will have a two car garage, parking in front of the garage door. The off-street parking provided would meet the Zoning Code requirements.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

**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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is an infill lot that is surrounded by development on all sides. It would not appear that endangered or threatened or rare species or their habitats will have a significant impact.

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)? (Source: 13) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: There is one large native oak tree located on the project site. The access drive to parcel three will encroach within the critical root zone (CRZ) of the oak tree. A minimal amount of surface grading will be required to occur within the CRZ. The installation of impervious surfaces within this area could reduce the oak trees ability to absorb water and impact the root aeration. All other future development will be located outside of the critical root zone (CRZ) of the oak trees. No oak trees will be removed by the future construction or site improvements.

**Mitigation Measure:** Any grading within the CRZ for the driveway will be required to be monitored by the projects arborist. Impervious pavers shall be installed for the area of the driveway that is within the CRZ.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is no evidence of wetland habitat on this site.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: This site would not appear to be a wildlife dispersal or mitigation corridor.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES.** Would the proposal:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?<br><br>Discussion: N/A   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient manner?<br><br>Discussion: N/A   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?<br><br>Discussion: N/A | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**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)?<br><br>Discussion: N/A | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?<br><br>Discussion: N/A   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards?<br><br>Discussion: N/A   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?<br><br>Discussion: N/A   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**X. NOISE.** Would the proposal result in:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Increases in existing noise levels? (Source 1)<br><br>Discussion: Besides the initial construction of the project, existing noise levels would not be significantly increased. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (Source 1)  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

Discussion: There will be construction noise during the construction phase of the project, but would still be within the allowable

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

tolerances as required by Chapter 17, the Building Code. For a residential project in a residential zone, it is not anticipated that there would be any severe noise levels.

**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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Emergency Services Department has reviewed the development and has provided the necessary conditions of approval to adequately address fire protection concerns. See discussion under transportation / circulation.

- |                       |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Police Protection? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- |             |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- |                                 |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Other governmental services? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

**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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Southern California Gas Company provides service to the Paso Robles area. The project is not anticipated to interfere with gas services or create an unmet demand.

- |                           |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Communication systems? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The Pacific Bell Company provides service to the Paso Robles and County areas. The project is not anticipated to interfere with phone/communication services.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Sewer or septic tanks? (Source: 7) Discussion: The project will be required to hook up to City sewer services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Storm water drainage? (Source: 6) Discussion: See Section IVa.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Solid waste disposal? Discussion: Each lot would be served by Paso Robles Waste.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Local or regional water supplies? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**XIII.AESTHETICS.** Would the proposal:

a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (Source: 1,9) Discussion: This project is not located on a scenic vista or highway.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (Source: 1,9) Discussion: The building sites are located in areas under ten percent slope and future construction will not require excessive grading. Each lot would have to comply with the Zoning Ordinance for landscape requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Create light or glare? (Source: 1,9) Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**XIV.CULTURAL RESOURCES.** Would the proposal:

a) Disturb paleontological resources? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Disturb archaeological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The Paso Robles area has been classified as territory occupied by the Migueleno Salinan and the Obispeno Chumash Native California populations. Past community populations have been evidenced at several sites within the Paso Robles area and unincorporated portions of the surrounding County.

If, during any future construction excavation, any buried or isolated cultural materials are unearthed, work in the affected area should stop until these materials can be examined by a qualified Archeologist and appropriate recommendations made regarding their treatment and/or disposition. Such examination should be conducted under the coordination of the City of Paso Robles.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Affect historical resources?  Discussion: See XIV b.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?  Discussion: N/A.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?  Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**XV.RECREATION.** Would the proposal:

a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?  Discussion: N/A.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?  Discussion: N/A.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**XVI.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: It would not appear that there would be any significant impacts in this section.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?  Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.)  Discussion: The project is anticipated within the City’s General Plan and Zoning documents. It would appear that it meets	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

the requirements of those documents. There would not be a significant cumulative impact.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project would meet the requirements and intent of the Zoning Code and General Plan for development within R-2 designated properties.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact
		Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact		
					No Impact

## 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	1977 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 Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
10	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
11	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
12	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446
13	Applicant’s Project Description	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

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

## **Summary of Mitigation Measures**

### **Description of Impact**

Grading / driveway within the CRZ of a native oak tree.

Inadequate emergency access to parcel 3.

### **Mitigation Measure**

The project arborist shall monitor construction activities within the CRZ and the portion of the driveway that is within the CRZ will be constructed with impervious pavers

An approved fire department turn around will be required to be installed on parcel 3.

The future residence on parcel 3 will be required to be equipped with residential fire sprinklers.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------