

**ADDENDUM TO MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
NEW SINGLE FAMILY HOUSE  
2512 EAST CHEVY CHASE DRIVE/910 LAIRD DRIVE**

**INTRODUCTION**

On March 11, 2014, the Planning Hearing Officer adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) prepared for Conditional Use Permit Case No. PCUP 1322910 that evaluated the construction of a 4,143 square-foot 2-story house with attached 3-car garage and detached 500 square foot guest house on the 1.86 acre site with an average current slope of 56 percent, located at 2512 East Chevy Chase Drive, located in the "R1R"- Restricted Residential Zone. At the time of the proposal, the project required the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) because the average current slope of the lot exceeded 50%. Approval of a Conditional Use Permit is no longer required for lot slopes exceeding 50%. The purpose of this addendum is to evaluate a new single family house proposed on the same lot that is similar in size and characteristics to the single-family residence evaluated in the previously adopted MND.

**DISCUSSION OF PROJECT CHANGES**

The current proposal includes the construction of a new 3,740 square-foot single-family house with an attached 3-car garage. The house size was reduced by 403 square feet and the 500 square-foot guest house was eliminated. The driveway location was changed from East Chevy Chase to Laird Drive, because the driveway slope was too steep to meet Code requirements. The site conditions are unchanged in that the topography of the site remains a steep up-slope lot with an average current slope of 56 percent.

**CEQA GUIDELINES**

Pursuant to Title 14 CCR Section 15162, Subsequent Negative Declarations, subsection (a), when a negative declaration has been adopted for a project, no subsequent negative declaration shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous negative declaration;

- (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous negative declaration;

Section 15164 of Title 14 CCR allows for the preparation of an addendum if some changes to a previously adopted negative declaration are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent negative declaration have occurred.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

### **Aesthetics**

As analyzed in Section A of the MND, no significant impacts to aesthetics are identified and no mitigation measures are required. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Agricultural Resources**

As analyzed in Section B of the MND, no impacts to agricultural resources are identified and no mitigation measures are required. No forest land will be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No additional agricultural or forest land will be lost as a result of the revised project. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Air Quality**

As analyzed in Section C of the MND, no significant impacts to air quality are identified and no mitigation measures are required. Results from the URBEMIS 2007 (Version 9.2.2) air quality modeling software, provided by the SCAQMD and CARB, indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area or operational impacts. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Biological Resources**

As analyzed in Section D of the MND, there are 24 protected indigenous trees on the property or within 20 feet of the property line, including one City street tree, identified as a Western Sycamore tree. Unlike the previous proposal, which included the loss of one 25-inch diameter oak tree, the existing oak trees will be preserved and will not be impacted as a result of the new development. The current proposal has minimal encroachment on the existing protected trees. The access road will encroach on 12 protected trees. No impacts to biological resources are identified. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Cultural Resources**

As analyzed in Section E of the MND, no impacts to cultural resources are identified and no mitigation measures are required. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

## **Geology and Soils**

As analyzed in Section F of the MND, no significant impacts to geology and soils are identified and no mitigation measures are required. However, the project is located in a landslide prone area. As with the previous project, the project will have less than significant environmental impacts with the mitigation incorporated. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

## **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has prepared the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which is part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Glendale has an adopted Greener Glendale Plan which meets regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by SCAG and adopted by the ARB. The Greener Glendale Plan uses land use development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, transportation measures and other policies that are determined to be feasible to reduce GHG.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

The project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions since the update is consistent with the Greener Glendale Plan. The proposed project is substantially the same as a previously approved. As a result, no new impacts are anticipated to result from the project. For the reasons above, the project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

As analyzed in Section G of the MND, no significant impacts to hazards and hazardous materials are identified and no mitigation measures are required. The revised project will not change the potential for impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

As analyzed in Section H of the MND, housing projects will follow Best Management Practices (BMPs) as specified by the NPDES permit and an approved SWPPP during construction, potential impacts associated with this issue will be reduced to a less than significant level. No significant impacts to hydrology and water quality are identified and no mitigation measures are required. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Land Use**

As analyzed in Section I of the MND, no land use impacts were identified and no mitigation measures are required. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Mineral Resources**

As analyzed in Section J of the MND, no impacts to mineral resources are identified and no mitigation measures are required. No additional land with mineral resources will be converted to residential development as a result of the revised project. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Noise**

As analyzed in Section K of the MND, no significant impacts to noise are identified and no mitigation measures are required. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Population and Housing**

As analyzed in Section L of the MND, no impacts to population and housing are identified and no mitigation measures are required. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Public Services**

As analyzed in Section M of the MND, no significant impacts to public services are identified and no mitigation measures are required. The changes to the project are similar to those identified in the MND; therefore, no new or substantially greater impacts would occur with

implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Recreation**

As analyzed in Section N of the MND, no impacts to recreation are identified and no mitigation measures are required. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Traffic and Transportation**

As analyzed in Section O of the MND, no impacts to traffic and transportation have been identified as potentially significant. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **Utilities and Service Systems**

As analyzed in Section P of the MND, no significant impacts to utilities and service systems are identified and no mitigation measures are required. No new or substantially greater impacts would occur with implementation of the revised project when compared to those identified in the previously adopted MND.

### **CEQA FINDINGS**

This Addendum concludes that the proposed single-family residence will not result any of the circumstances requiring a subsequent or supplemental MND. The information and analysis in this Addendum shows that:

- (1) No substantial changes are proposed, or have occurred, in the previously evaluated project, which will require major revisions to the previously adopted MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) No substantial changes are proposed or have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions of the previously adopted MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; and
- (3) No new information as defined by Public Resources Code Section 21166 and *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15162 related to the approved Project results in any new or more severe significant effects not discussed or shown in the previously adopted MND.