

RESOLUTION NO: 08-043

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
APPROVING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 08-005
(STUDIOS ON THE PARK)
APN: 009-103-010

WHEREAS, Section 21.16A, Planned Development District, projects located in the PD Overlay district are subject to Planning Commission approval of a development plan (PD); and

WHEREAS, Planned Development 08-005 has been filed by Larry Gabriel on behalf of Anne Laddon and Studios on the Park to renovate an existing building to accommodate an art studio; and

WHEREAS, the project is located at 1130 Pine Street; and

WHEREAS, the 9,375 square foot site is zoned C3-PD (Commercial / Light-Industrial, Planned Development Overlay), and has a General Plan designation of CC, (Community Commercial); and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (attached as Exhibit A) which concludes and proposes that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be approved; and

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

WHEREAS, at its September 9, 2008 meeting, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the Project, to accept public testimony on the proposal including Planned Development 08-005; 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 based on the attached Mitigation Agreement and mitigation measures described in the initial study and contained in the resolution approving PD 08-005 as site specific conditions summarized below.

Topic of Mitigation	Condition #
Cultural Resources – Historic Resources	9

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, to approve a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Planned Development 08-005 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 9th day of September 2008, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Holstine, Hodgkin, Treach, Flynn, Johnson, Peterson

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: Steinbeck

CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE TREATCH

ATTEST:

RON WHISENAND, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

H:\darren\PD\PD08-005sTUDIOS\NDRes

CITY OF PASO ROBLES – PLANNING DIVISION INITIAL STUDY

1. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: Studios on the Park – PD 08-005

LEAD AGENCY: City of Paso Robles - 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446

Contact: Darren Nash, Associate Planner
Telephone: (805) 237-3970

PROJECT LOCATION: 1130 Pine Street (APN 009-103-010)

PROJECT PROPONENT: Applicant: Anne Laddon
P.O. Box 2049, Paso Robles, CA 93447

**LEAD AGENCY CONTACT/
INITIAL STUDY PREPARED BY:** Darren Nash, Associate Planner

Telephone: (805) 237-3970
Facsimile: (805) 237-3904
E-Mail: dnash@prcity.com

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: CC (Community Commercial)

ZONING: C3-PD (Commercial/Light Industrial, Planned Development Overlay)

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Studios on the Park project consists of a Development Plan application (PD 08-005) to renovate and add a second and third floors to the existing building located at 1130 Pine Street. When completed, the Studios on the Park would be a non-profit art studio.

3. **OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL MAY BE REQUIRED (For example, issuance of permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

None.

4. **EARLIER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:**

This Initial Study incorporates by reference the City of El Paso de Robles General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH#2003011123).

5. **CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR THE PROJECT:**

This Initial Study relies on expert opinion supported by the facts, technical studies, and technical appendices of the City of El Paso de Robles General Plan EIR. These documents are incorporated herein by reference. They provide substantial evidence to document the basis upon which the City has arrived at its environmental determination regarding various resources.

6. PURPOSES OF AN INITIAL STUDY

The purposes of an Initial Study for a Development Project Application are:

- A. To provide the City with sufficient information and analysis to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or a Negative Declaration for a site specific development project proposal;
- B. To enable the Applicant of a site specific development project proposal or the City as the lead agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts before an Environmental Impact Report is required to be prepared, thereby enabling the proposed Project to qualify for issuance of a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration;
- C. To facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a project;
- D. To eliminate unnecessary EIRs;
- E. To explain the reasons for determining that potentially significant effects would not be significant;
- F. To determine if a previously prepared EIR could be used for the project;
- G. To assist in the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report if one is required; and
- H. To provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding of no significant effect as set forth in a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the a project.

7. EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS FOUND ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

A. Scope of Environmental Review

This Initial Study evaluates potential impacts identified in the following checklist.

B. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers to the questions presented on the following Environmental Checklist Form, except where the answer is that the proposed project will have “No Impact.” The “No Impact” answers are to be adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each question or as otherwise explained in the introductory remarks. 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 and/or general standards. The basis for the “No Impact” answers on the following Environmental Checklist Form is explained in further detail in this Initial Study in Section 9 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) and Section 10 (Context of Environmental Analysis for the Project).
2. All answers on the following Environmental Checklist Form must take into account the whole action involved with the project, including implementation. 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 9 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) 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). See Section 4 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) and Section 11 (Earlier Analysis and Background Materials) of this Initial Study.
6. References to the information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the Environmental Checklist Form. See Section 11 (Earlier Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation). Other sources used or individuals contacted are cited where appropriate.
7. The following Environmental Checklist Form generally is the same as the one contained in Title 14, California Code of Regulations; with some modifications to reflect the City’s needs and requirements.
8. Standard Conditions of Approval: The City imposes standard conditions of approval on Projects. These conditions are considered to be components of and/or modifications to the Project and some reduce or minimize environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. Because they are considered part of the Project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers’ information, the standard conditions identified in this Initial Study are available for review at the Community Development Department.
9. Certification Statement: The statements made in this Initial Study and those made in the documents referenced herein present the data and information that are required to satisfy the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) – Statutes and Guidelines, as well as the City’s Procedures for Implementing CEQA. Further, the facts, statements, information, and analysis presented are true and correct in accordance with standard business practices of qualified professionals with expertise in the development review process, including building, planning, and engineering.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The proposed project may potentially affect the environmental factors checked below, and may involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” if so indicated on the following Environmental Checklist Form (Pages 8 to.15)

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | | |

9. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation: I find that:

The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment; and, therefore, a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

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. Therefore, a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment; and, therefore an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

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.”

Therefore, an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it will analyze only the effect or effects that remain to be addressed.

Signature:

Date:

August 19, 2008

Darren Nash, Associate Planner

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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? (Sources: 1 & 8)

Discussion: The proposed project will not conflict with the General Plan or zoning district. Art studios (trade schools & artisans) are a permitted use in the C3-PD zoning district and CC land use category.

- b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The proposed project complies with the EIR certified for the City General Plan Update, 2003 and other adopted environmental policies that apply to this property.

- c) Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: An art studio in the downtown area will provide a unique open studio environment for both the artist working in the studio and for community residents to visit and participate in. The art studio would not seem to be an incompatible use in the downtown area.

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

Discussion: The project site is an urban infill property with no agricultural uses, resources or operations on near the property.

- e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The project will not disrupt or divide a physical arrangement of an established community.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

- a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The project will not residential and therefore will not exceed regional or local 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)? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The will not induce growth.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? (Sources: 1, 3, & 5)

Discussion: The existing building is currently vacant and has not been used as residential, therefore, the development of the Studios project will not displace existing housing.

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

- a) Fault rupture? (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 this valley. The 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. Review of available information and examinations indicate that neither of these faults is active with respect to ground rupture in Paso Robles. Soils 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. In addition, per requirements of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, only structures for human habitation need to be setback a minimum of 50 feet of a known active trace fault.

- b) Seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: The City is located within an active earthquake area that could experience seismic ground shaking from the Rinconada and San Andreas Faults. The proposed structure will be constructed to current UBC 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.

- c) Seismic 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 due to soil conditions. The EIR identifies measures to reduce this potential impact, which will be incorporated into this project. This includes a requirement to conduct a site-specific analysis of liquefaction potential. Based on analysis results, the project design and construction will include specific design requirements to reduce the potential impacts on structures due to liquefaction to a less than significant level.

- d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

- e) Landslides or Mudflows? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: d. and e. The project site is not located near bodies of water or volcanic hazards, nor is the site located in an area subject to landslides or mudflows.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, & 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR the soil condition is not erosive or otherwise unstable. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Subsidence of the land? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See Item c.

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| h) Expansive soils? (Sources: 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Not applicable.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Unique geologic or physical features? (Sources: 1 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no unique geologic or physical features on or near the project site.

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

10 Environmental Checklist Form

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Impacts to groundwater quality? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: a-i

The Studios project consists of renovating and reusing an existing building. With the development of the project, the building will be built out to the property lines (zero lot line) just as the existing building is. There will not be any ground surface remaining, all water collected on the roof system will be collected and piped to the storm drains in a manner approved by the Building Official and City Engineer.

Besides sinks and restrooms, this building will not utilize ground water any more than any other commercial building or its size.

With the submittal of construction drawings to the building dept., it will be required that an Industrial Waste Discharge Permit be filed to insure that there are no un-wanted discharges into the City's sewer or storm drain system.

The building will not have a significant impact to water run-off, flooding, water discharge, and ground water (quantity or quality).

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The partial demolition of the structure will need to obtain applicable permits and comply with site disturbance regulations from the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District in compliance with the Districts demo regulations per the adopted Clean Air Plan prior to commencing activities. Therefore, impacts to air quality from this project will be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals, etc. within the near vicinity that could be impacted by this project.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: This project does not have the potential to significantly alter air movement, moisture, or temperature.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Create objectionable odors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>Discussion: This project does not have the potential to create objectionable odors.</i>				

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Since the project complies with the general plan and zoning designations, and since it is re-use of an existing building it is not anticipated to be a significant impact.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project does not include road improvements that may result in safety hazards or in incompatible uses.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is adequately served by public streets for emergency services.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?
(Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is located in the downtown parking district and has the ability to pay in-lieu fees for parking spaces required with the incremental increase in building square footage. With the payment of the necessary fees, the project would meet the zoning code requirements for parking, and therefore not be a significant impact.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?
(Source: 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not have hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
(Sources: 1 & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not conflict with or otherwise affect adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.

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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

Discussion: The project could not affect rail, waterborne or air traffic.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to: plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?

Discussion: There are no endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats located on the project site. Thus, there could not be potential impacts to endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats.

b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?

Discussion: There are no locally designated species, including oak trees on the project site.

c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?

Discussion: See item b. above.

d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?

Discussion: There are no wetland habitats on or near the project site.

e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

Discussion: The site is not part of a wildlife dispersal or migration corridor.

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (Sources: 1 & 7)

Discussion: This project could not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.

b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (Sources: 1 & 7)

Discussion: The project will not use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient manner.

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? (Sources: 1 & 7)

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

Discussion: The project is not located in an area of a known mineral resources that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State.

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

Discussion: The project will not result in a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances since demolition project do not generally uses these types of substances. The applicant will need to comply with SLOAPCD regulations regarding asbestos removal should this material be encountered in the structures. Therefore, impacts resulting from potential release of hazardous materials will be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan since it is not a designated emergency response location to be used for staging or other uses in an emergency.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: see a. above.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not located in an area with the potential for increased fire hazards.

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increases in existing noise levels? (Sources: 1, 7, & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not likely result in a significant increase in operational noise levels. It may result in short-term construction noise. However, construction noise will be limited to specific daytime hours per city regulations.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (Source: 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is not located in the vicinity where it would expose people to 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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

any of the following areas:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 3, 6, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Schools? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Other governmental services? (Sources: 1,3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: a.-e. The project applicant will be required to pay development impact fees as established by the city per AB 1600 to mitigate impacts to public services as applicable.

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? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Communication systems? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Sewer or septic tanks? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Storm water drainage? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Solid waste disposal? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Local or regional water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: a.-g. The project will not result in the need for new systems or supplies, or result in substantial alterations to utilities and service systems. Solid waste will be disposed of and taken to the local land fills and meet the criteria outlined by the Air Pollution Control District (APCD).

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

Discussion: The project is not located in a scenic vista or scenic highway area.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: This project will result in a more positive effect since it will provide expansion and reuse in a currently vacant building that needs to be brought into compliance with current codes. The review of the development plan by the Planning Commission will insure that the building is consistent with the downtown guidelines and have a positive aesthetic effect to the downtown.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Create light or glare? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Through the review of the construction drawings, Staff will insure that any exterior lights are appropriately shielded..

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Disturb paleontological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Disturb archaeological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: a.-b. The project site is not located in an area with known paleontological or archaeological resources. If these types of resources are found during grading and excavation, appropriate procedures will be followed including halting activities and contacting the County Coroner, and follow standard mitigation procedures.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Affect historical resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The subject property is not currently listed as a potential historical resource by the City’s current Historical Resource Inventory. However, subsequent analysis by the historians assisting the City in the update of the City’s inventory has identified the building as meeting CEQA’s threshold of historic significance. The circumstances that make this particular building significant relate its origin as 1930’s Packard/Hudson showroom. The City of Paso Robles, being located between the metropolitan areas of Los Angeles and San Francisco, had its commercial core built adjacent to the State Highway which is now Spring Street. Many auto oriented uses, such as motor hotels, service stations, etc. were drawn to the downtown and Spring Street corridor.

Relocation of the State Highway, changes in transportation technology, and general redevelopment of our downtown core have all contributed to the loss of many of these representative examples of our auto orientation businesses and early 1900’s architecture. Because of its construction, this building has survived changes in architectural character of our downtown. Character defining features of the building that contribute to its historical significance include:

- Pine Street Storefront façade
- Board form concrete walls and “pebble” stucco
- Interior open wooden truss system
- Blade sign
- Scored concrete flooring
- Hip roof design and profile

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

The project involves retaining historic building elements, modifying the Pine Street entry to meet the tenant needs, and expanding the building to include a new Railroad Street façade as well as second and third story space. The Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Buildings allow for modification of historic resources. However, in order to mitigate detrimental changes to the historical significance of the building, key building features need to be preserved and maintained in order to protect and not overshadow the elements significance. To that end, the following mitigation measures are required:

1. The Pine Street façade shall remain including the pebble texture. Changes in building entry features and front windows shall be subject to approval of the Community Development Director. Window sill height shall be compatible with downtown storefront design and close to 24 inches high.
2. The second floor shall be set back a minimum of 14 feet from the front façade. The third floor shall be limited to the rear half of the building.
3. The new roof shall maintain similar angles and gable design.
4. The side concrete walls shall remain in place.
5. The scored concrete floor shall remain and new flooring at the rear of the first floor shall be compatible.
6. Photo documentation of the building's interior shall be completed prior to construction. The wooden truss system can be removed due to structural issues. However, the project shall include interior project features such as decorative trim, stairways, railing, etc. that emulates the truss pattern of the original roof and re-uses it in an interpretive manner.
7. Keep interior ceilings high and open to the maximum extent possible
8. The existing blade sign shall be incorporated into the proposed design

- d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: See c. above.

- e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: Discussion: There are no known religious or sacred uses on or near the project site.

XV.RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project will not significantly affect the demand for parks and recreational facilities.

- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project will not affect existing recreational opportunities.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the

10 Environmental Checklist Form

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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? (Sources: 1 & 3)</p> <p><i>Discussion: The project does not 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.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? (Sources: 1 & 3)</p> <p><i>Discussion: The project will not likely have a potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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.) (Sources: 1 & 3)</p> <p><i>Discussion: The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1 & 3)</p> <p><i>Discussion: The project will not result in substantial adverse environmental impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

11. 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). The earlier documents that have been used in this Initial Study are listed below.

Reference Number	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	Seismic Safety Element for City of Paso Robles	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
3	Final Environmental Impact Report City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
4	Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, California Paso Robles Area	USDA-NRCS, 65 Main Street-Suite 108 Templeton, CA 93465
5	Uniform Building Code	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
6	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval For New Development	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
7	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
8	City of Paso Robles, Water Master Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
9	City of Paso Robles, Sewer Master Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
10	Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446