

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING HEARING OFFICER  
OF THE CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA,  
ADOPTING A CERTAIN MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
PREPARED PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

**WHEREAS**, The Director of Community Development considered the Initial Study prepared on behalf of Conditional Use Permit Case No. PCUP 1322910 for construction of a 4,143 sq. ft. 2-story house with attached 3-car garage and detached 500 sq. ft. guest house on the 1.86 acre site with an average current slope of 56 percent, located at 2512 E. Chevy Chase Dr., and approved on January 3, 2014, a Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; and

**WHEREAS**, the Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration was made available for a 20-day public review and comment period; and

**WHEREAS**, a Final Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared incorporating any comments received during the review period and any responses to those comments; and

**WHEREAS**, the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the City of Glendale; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Hearing Officer has read and considered the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Hearing Officer acknowledges the findings of the Director of Community Development with respect to the preparation of the Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

**WHEREAS**, the Glendale Planning and Neighborhood Services Division has been identified as the custodian of record for the Negative Declaration.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Hearing Officer of the City of Glendale finds on the basis of the whole record including the Initial Study and any comments received that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment, and that the Planning Hearing Officer adopts Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared on behalf of Conditional Use Permit Case No. PCUP 1322910.

Adopted this 11 day of March, 2014

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hearing Officer



**PROPOSED  
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
PCUP 1322910  
2512 E. Chevy Chase Dr.**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>The following Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.</p> |   |
| <b>Project Title/Common Name:</b>  | New single family house   |
| <b>Project Location:</b>   | 2512 E. Chevy Chase Dr., Glendale, Los Angeles County   |
| <b>Project Description:</b>  | <p>The project is the construction of a 4,143 sq. ft. two-story house with attached 3-car garage and detached 500 sq. ft. guest house on a vacant 1.86 acre lot. Grading will consist of 1,000 c.y. of cut, 500 c.y. of fill with a net export of 500 c.y. of dirt.</p> <p>The project, as proposed, will require a conditional use permit because the average current slope is greater than 50 percent and more than 1,500 cubic yards of grading will occur. The project will also require approval from the Design Review Board.</p> |
| <b>Project Type:</b>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Project <input type="checkbox"/> Public Project   |
| <b>Project Applicant:</b>  | Paul Firestone, 14630 Dickens St. #308, Sherman Oaks, CA 91403  |
| <b>Findings:</b>   | <p>The Director of Community Development, on _____, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Negative Declaration be prepared.</p>  |
| <b>Mitigation Measures:</b>  | See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program  |
| <b>Attachments:</b>  | Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; Initial Study Checklist<br>PCUP 1322910  |
| <b>Contact Person:</b>   | <p>Jeff Hamilton, Senior Planner<br/>City of Glendale Planning and Neighborhood Services Division<br/>633 East Broadway Room 103<br/>Glendale, CA 91206-4386<br/>Tel: (818) 937-8157                      Fax: (818) 240-0392</p>   |

**PCUP 1322910  
2512 E. CHEVY CHASE DRIVE  
MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM**

The following mitigation measures shall apply to the project to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

The applicant shall comply with the following indigenous tree protection measures. Failure to comply with these mitigation measures may result in work stoppage and will result in fee of \$1,000.00 per tree, per violation. Work shall resume only when the City of Glendale deems reparations satisfactory.

1. Applicant is permitted to perform work near 24 protected trees for the purpose of developing subject property, including access roadway, retaining walls and construction of a single family dwelling. The indigenous trees are identified as coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), scrub oak (*Quercus berberidifolia*) and Western sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*) trees as designated in the approved arborist report prepared by Rebecca Latta , Consulting Arborist, dated September 12, 2013. Permission is contingent upon the City of Glendale approval of the proposed plan for site development.
2. All project plans; including grading, site improvements, utility locations, and landscaping shall indicate the exact trunk location of the native oak(s) and its protected zone.
3. On the project site and adjacent to the project site there are 24 protected trees, including one city street tree identified as a Western sycamore tree. Therefore an Indigenous Tree encroachment permit(s) from the Public Works Building and Safety Division will be required prior to any site disturbance. Permit fee will be \$450.00.

**Mitigation Measures 1-3**

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Monitoring Action:</b> | Plan review                              |
| <b>Timing:</b>            | Prior to issuance of development permits |
| <b>Responsibility:</b>    | Director of Public Works                 |

4. All utility improvements with installation of hook-up boxes, including but not limited to water, sewer, electrical, cable and phone lines are to be located outside the indigenous tree protected zone (TPZ). Utility lines shall be routed outside of the protected zone of protected trees, unless otherwise approved by the Director of Public Works.
5. To mitigate the loss of one 25-inch diameter oak tree, one 24-inch box coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) and three 5-gallon interior scrub oak (*Quercus berberifolia*) taken from locally native genetic stock shall be planted near the location of the tree being removed.
6. Trees shall be planted between October and March.
7. Trees shall be purchased that meet the minimum standards for nursery quality as described on this website: <http://www.urbantree.org/specs.asp>
8. Prune trees to direct growth using the small tree training guidelines provided on this website: [http://www.fire.ca.gov/resource\\_mgt/downloads/Pruningcard.pdf](http://www.fire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/downloads/Pruningcard.pdf)

**Mitigation Measures 4-8**

|                           |                 |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Monitoring Action:</b> | Plan review     |
|                           | Site inspection |

**Timing:** Prior to issuance of development permits  
 During any construction related activities, including but not limited to demolition, site preparation, grading, or building construction

**Responsibility:** Director of Public Works

9. Prior to any site disturbance, including demolition or mobilization, install a six-foot tall temporary chain-link fence, five feet outside of the drip-line of each protected tree, or per a Protected Tree Fencing Plan approved by the Director of Public Works.
10. Inspection of the temporary fencing installation is required prior to any site disturbance, including grubbing, demolition and mobilization. Contact the Public Works Permit Services Center at (818) 548-3200.

**Mitigation Measures 9-10**

**Monitoring Action:** Site inspection

**Timing:** Prior to any site disturbance

**Responsibility:** Director of Public Works

11. The approved Indigenous Tree Permit shall be maintained on the project site at all times and shall be presented upon request to any City official.
12. Forty-eight (48) hours notice shall be provided to the Public Works Permit Services Center at (818) 548-3200 prior to the start of any authorized work within the protected zone of any protected tree.
13. In general, take such steps as necessary to protect roots, bark, trunk, branches and leaves from injury during construction.
14. Monitor protected trees for drought stress throughout construction and irrigate as needed to maintain health.
15. Maintain three inches of natural leaf litter beneath the dripline of each protected tree. Use approved organic mulch if leaf litter is not available.
16. No herbicides shall be used within 100 feet of any protected tree unless approval is provided in writing by the Director of Public Works.
17. No tools, equipment, materials, vehicles, debris, paint, concrete, mortar, cement, stucco, paint, solvent, excess soil or other foreign materials shall be placed within the protected zone of any protected tree at any time, except as authorized by the Director of Public works.
18. Any approved excavation within the protected zone of any protected tree shall be performed with hand tools only under the direct observation of the designated project arborist at all times. Light construction equipment may be used with the written approval of the Director of Public Works.
19. Excavate and tunnel beneath roots one-inch in diameter and greater where feasible. Roots to be removed shall be pruned with a sharp pruning tool at the edge of the excavation. Cover temporarily exposed roots with moist burlap until backfill occurs.

**Mitigation Measures 11-19**

**Monitoring Action:** Site inspection

**Timing:** During any construction related activities, including but not limited to demolition, site preparation, grading, or building construction.

**Responsibility:** Director of Public Works

20. Applicant will employ the Arborist of Record (AOR) for professional arboricultural services for further advice and oversight of this project. A signed copy of the AOR contract will be submitted as part of the approval process.
21. All site development plans, including grading, planting and irrigation and their installation(s) will be reviewed and approved by the AOR prior to the start of construction and are subject to approval by the Public Works Department.
22. A grading plan, approved by the AOR, will be submitted as an addendum to city approved tree report as part of the conditions of final approval.
23. Any changes or addendums to the approved plans will be reviewed and approved, in writing, by the AOR.

**Mitigation Measures 20-23**

**Monitoring Action:** Plan review  
**Timing:** Prior to issuance of development permits  
**Responsibility:** Arborist of Record; Public Works Department

24. All approved pruning of canopy and/or cutting of roots shall be performed under the direct supervision of the project AOR in accordance with The Pruning Standards of the Western Chapter of the International Society of Arboriculture.
25. All recommendations contained in the approved arborist report will be adhered to carefully. All work within the protected zone of affected trees will be directed by the AOR.
26. The AOR will notify the City of any unsatisfactory conditions or of any non-compliance issues with conditions of approval or Indigenous Tree permit conditions. Site monitoring is required and will be supported by regular, written reports submitted to the City of Glendale Public Works Division as a condition of approval. Due to pre-construction utility work by GWP within the critical root zone of the city owned Western sycamore tree within the public right-of-way relative to this sites development, the sycamore street tree will be included in the monitoring reports for the duration of this project.

**Mitigation Measures 24-26**

**Monitoring Action:** Site Inspection  
**Timing:** During any construction related activities, including but not limited to demolition, site preparation, grading, or building construction.  
**Responsibility:** Arborist of Record

27. The temporary fencing installation shall be maintained until written authorization is received for relocation or removal from the Director of Public Works.
28. City will require post-construction monitoring of protected trees and the applicant must plant new indigenous trees to replace any that die as a result of impacts from construction. The AOR will prepare a Monitoring Plan for the indigenous tree(s) impacted by this project, and will conduct all post-monitoring inspections. Frequency for all inspections will be at the discretion of the Urban Forester, which will be based on findings of the AOR's last report and approved Monitoring Plan, and determined at the end of the project, but before final sign-off.

**Mitigation Measures 27-28**

**Monitoring Action:** Site Inspection  
**Timing:** Upon completion of the project prior to final of building permit  
**Responsibility:** Director Public Works; Arborist of Record; Urban Forester

---

**Agreement to Proposed Mitigation Measures and Mitigation Monitoring Program**

I/WE THE UNDERSIGNED PROJECT APPLICANT (S), HEREBY AGREE TO MODIFICATION OF THE PROJECT TO CONFORM WITH THE IMPACT MITIGATION MEASURES AND THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM SPECIFIED HEREIN REGARDLESS OF CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP. IF I/WE DISAGREE WITH ANY RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES OR ALL OR PART OF THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, IN LIEU OF MY/OUR SIGNATURE HEREON, I/WE MAY REQUEST RECONSIDERATION OF THE MATTER UPON SUBMITTAL OF THE APPLICABLE FEE AND DOCUMENTATION IN SUPPORT OF MY/OUR POSITION ON SAID MITIGATION MEASURES AND/OR MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM. (THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING BOARD WILL RECONSIDER THE ISSUES AND TAKE ACTION AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE.)

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature(s) of the Project Applicant(s)

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



|     |   |
|-----|---|
| 1.  | <b>Project Title:</b> New single family house   |
| 2.  | <b>Lead Agency Name and Address:</b><br>City of Glendale Planning Division<br>633 East Broadway, Room 103<br>Glendale, CA 91206   |
| 3.  | <b>Contact Person and Phone Number:</b><br>Jeff Hamilton, Senior Planner<br>Tel: (818) 937-8157<br>Fax: (818) 240-0392  |
| 4.  | <b>Project Location:</b> 2512 E. Chevy Chase Dr., Glendale, 912016, Los Angeles County  |
| 5.  | <b>Project Sponsor's Name and Address:</b><br>Paul Firestone<br>14630 Dickens St. #308, Sherman Oaks, CA 91403  |
| 6.  | <b>General Plan Designation:</b> Low Density Residential  |
| 7.  | <b>Zoning:</b> R1R (Restricted Residential) zone, Floor Area District II  |
| 8.  | <b>Description of the Project:</b> The project is the construction of a 4,143 sq. ft. two-story house with attached 3-car garage and detached 500 sq. ft. guest house on a vacant 1.86 acre lot. Grading will consist of 1,000 c.y. of cut, 500 c.y. of fill with a net export of 500 c.y. of dirt.<br><br>The project, as proposed, will require a conditional use permit because the average current slope is greater than 50 percent and more than 1,500 cubic yards of grading will occur. The project will also require approval from the Design Review Board. |
| 9.  | <b>Surrounding Zoning, Land Uses and Setting:</b><br><u>North:</u> R1R II (Restricted Residential Floor Area Ratio District II) zone; single family homes.<br><u>South:</u> SR (Special Recreation) zone; undeveloped hillside.<br><u>East:</u> R1R II; single family homes.<br><u>West:</u> R1R II; single family homes.   |
| 10. | <b>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).</b><br>None.  |

**11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |

**LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed by \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Director of Community Development or his or her designee authorizing the release of the environmental document for public review and comment.

Director of Community Development \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

**12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

The following section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

**A. AESTHETICS**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?                                    |                                |   | X                            |           |

1) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is vacant and undeveloped. It is located at the bottom of Chevy Chase canyon and slopes upward from the street towards the southeast. A 35-foot tall, 4,143 square foot two-story home is proposed for the 1.86 acre site, along with an attached 700 square foot garage and detached 500 square foot guest house. The proposed residence will be located near the middle of the property and over 100 feet from the closest street (Chevy Chase Drive) and over 50 feet from the closest house to the north. No scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element (January, 1993), exist within, or in proximity to, the project site. There are a number of oak trees on the property and others are located within 20 feet of the site. One oak tree is proposed to be removed as part of the development of the site. The loss of this tree is addressed in Biological Resources and is fully mitigated. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would result from project implementation.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?***

**No Impact.** No state scenic highway is located adjacent to, or within view of, the project site. No impacts to scenic resources within a State scenic highway would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is vacant and undeveloped. The proposed structures will be partially screened by the existing trees and topography. Impacts to visual character and quality of the site caused by the new construction would be minimal.

The area surrounding the project site includes vacant lots and many single-family residences, which are located to the east, west, and north of the subject property. These residences were constructed in the 1920's through the 1960's. Homes in this area showcase various architectural styles. The proposed project is a single-family residence in an area with many similar structures.

The proposed project will require Design Review Board approval. The intent and purpose of the Board, in part, is to protect the community from adverse effects of poor design and to encourage good professional design practices. The Board will review the site planning, architecture, materials, and landscaping to ensure the project design is compatible with the surrounding built environment.

There are Coast Live Oak trees on the lot and on adjacent lots, within close proximity to the subject property. According to the Arborist report submitted by the applicant for this project, all but one existing oak tree on the subject site and adjacent properties are proposed to be preserved. The removal of one oak tree is mitigated by a series of mitigation measures listed under Biological Resources, including planting a replacement tree. The urban forester has reviewed the proposed plans and the arborist report prepared for the project and has determined that the proposed residence will not significantly impact the on and off-site oak trees.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) **Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The construction of a single-family residence would not create new source of substantial light or glare. Day and nighttime lighting for the project would only represent a slight increase and would be similar to the existing single-family uses within the project vicinity. Therefore, no significant impacts associated with day and nighttime lighting are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**B. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES**

| <p><i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project, in determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's Inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i></p> | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| <p>1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| <p>2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| <p>3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?</p>   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| <p>4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>   |                                |   |                              | X         |

|   |                                |   |                              |           |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| <p><i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project, in determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i></p> |                                |   |                              |           |
| <p>5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |

- 1) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**  
No Impact. There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide significance within or adjacent to the proposed project site and no agricultural activities take place on the project site. No agricultural use zone currently exists within Glendale, nor are any agricultural zones proposed. No impacts associated would occur.  
Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.
- 2) **Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**  
No Impact. The proposed project site is located in a highly-urbanized. No portion of the project site is proposed to include agricultural zoning designations or uses, nor do any such uses exist within Glendale under the current General Plan and zoning. There are no Williamson Act contracts in effect for the project site or surrounding vicinity. No conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract would result. No impacts would occur.  
Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.
- 3) **Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?**  
No Impact. There is no existing zoning of forest land or timberland in the City of Glendale. No impacts would occur.  
Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.
- 4) **Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**  
No Impact. There is no forest land within the City of Glendale. No forest land would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impacts would occur.  
Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.
- 5) **Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

**No Impact.** There is no farmland or forest land in the vicinity of or on the proposed project site. No farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use and no forest land would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**C. AIR QUALITY**

| <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?   |                                       |  |                                     | <b>X</b>         |
| 2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?  |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |
| 3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |
| 4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |
| 5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?   |                                       |  | <b>X</b>                            |                  |

**1) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?**

**No Impact.** The project site is located within the city of Glendale, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the agency responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. The most recent comprehensive plan fully approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is the 2012 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

The AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumption used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily emissions thresholds.

Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the Growth Management Chapter forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP.

Population growth associated with the proposed project is included in the Southern California Associations of Government (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The proposed project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to

---

exceed the SCAG forecast. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts. Therefore, no impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 2) ***Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The URBEMIS 2007 model (Version 9.2.4) was used to estimate air quality impacts during the construction and operation stages of the project. Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results are attached. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 3) ***Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** As indicated in the air quality model run described above, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. No significant impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 4) ***Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Sensitive residential receptors are located adjacent to the project site. However, the project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD that govern construction related impacts. In addition, as indicated in the model run performed for this project, no construction or operational impacts are anticipated. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration and therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) ***Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project includes the construction of a new two-story single-family residence. The area surrounding the subject site is zoned for and developed with single-family residences. The proposed project is an infill project and its use is consistent with the adjoining uses. Activity typically associated with the construction of a new home may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust in proximity to sensitive receptor locations. Any detectable odors or heavy-duty equipment exhaust would only be associated with the initial construction phase of the project. This phase is considered short-term and typical for this type of construction activity. Significant long-term odor impacts are not anticipated to occur after construction-related activity ceased since only one single-family residential use is proposed. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |                                | X   |                              |           |
| 2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  |                                | X   |                              |           |
| 6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?   |                                |   |                              | X         |

- 1) ***Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** The project site is located in the San Rafael Hills. A biological resources survey of publicly owned and un-subdivided privately held parcels in the San Rafael Hills was conducted as part of the City's Open Space and Conservation Element. The purpose of the survey was to map significant vegetation communities that include chaparral areas, oak woodlands, southern oak riparian, and walnut. The results of survey are shown in Map 4-10 of the element. The project site is located within these areas.

The Element also includes information on the open space areas within Glendale identified by the California Department of Fish and Game Natural Diversity Data Base and the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning "Significant Ecological Area" (SEA) program. The Natural Diversity Data Base and SEA program analyze biotic resources and identify areas with sensitive plant and animal communities. Map 4-13, "Southern Oak Riparian Forest," shows the findings of the Natural Diversity Data Base, and Map 4-12 illustrates the locations of Glendale's Significant Ecological Areas. The proposed project site is not located within the Significant Ecological Area (SEA), but it is within the general Southern Oak Riparian Community. Several oak trees are located on and adjacent to the project site. One oak tree, identified as tree 19 on the tree survey, is proposed to be removed.

The mitigation measures listed below are recommended to reduce the impact on biological resources to a less than significant level.

1. Applicant is permitted to perform work near 24 protected trees for the purpose of developing subject property, including access roadway, retaining walls and construction of a single family dwelling. The indigenous trees are identified as coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), scrub oak (*Quercus berberidifolia*) and Western sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*) trees as designated in the approved arborist report prepared by Rebecca Latta , Consulting Arborist, dated September 12, 2013. Permission is contingent upon the City of Glendale approval of the proposed plan for site development.
2. All project plans; including grading, site improvements, utility locations, and landscaping shall indicate the exact trunk location of the native oak(s) and its protected zone.
3. On the project site and adjacent to the project site there are 24 protected trees, including one city street tree identified as a Western sycamore tree. Therefore an Indigenous Tree encroachment permit(s) from the Public Works Building and Safety Division will be required prior to any site disturbance. Permit fee will be \$450.00.

**Mitigation Measures 1-3**

**Monitoring Action:** Plan review  
**Timing:** Prior to issuance of development permits  
**Responsibility:** Director of Public Works

4. All utility improvements with installation of hook-up boxes, including but not limited to water, sewer, electrical, cable and phone lines are to be located outside the indigenous tree protected zone (TPZ). Utility lines shall be routed outside of the protected zone of protected trees, unless otherwise approved by the Director of Public Works.
5. To mitigate the loss of one 25-inch diameter oak tree, one 24-inch box coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) and three 5-gallon interior scrub oak (*Quercus berberifolia*) taken from locally native genetic stock shall be planted near the location of the tree being removed.
6. Trees shall be planted between October and March.
7. Trees shall be purchased that meet the minimum standards for nursery quality as described on this website: <http://www.urbantree.org/specs.asp>
8. Prune trees to direct growth using the small tree training guidelines provided on this website: [http://www.fire.ca.gov/resource\\_mgt/downloads/Pruningcard.pdf](http://www.fire.ca.gov/resource_mgt/downloads/Pruningcard.pdf)

**Mitigation Measures 4-8**

**Monitoring Action:** Plan review  
 Site inspection  
**Timing:** Prior to issuance of development permits  
 During any construction related activities, including but not limited to demolition, site preparation, grading, or building construction  
**Responsibility:** Director of Public Works

9. Prior to any site disturbance, including demolition or mobilization, install a six-foot tall temporary chain-link fence, five feet outside of the drip-line of each protected tree, or per a Protected Tree Fencing Plan approved by the Director of Public Works.
10. Inspection of the temporary fencing installation is required prior to any site disturbance, including grubbing, demolition and mobilization. Contact the Public Works Permit Services Center at (818) 548-3200.

**Mitigation Measures 9-10**

**Monitoring Action:** Site inspection  
**Timing:** Prior to any site disturbance  
**Responsibility:** Director of Public Works

11. The approved Indigenous Tree Permit shall be maintained on the project site at all times and shall be presented upon request to any City official.
12. Forty-eight (48) hours notice shall be provided to the Public Works Permit Services Center at (818) 548-3200 prior to the start of any authorized work within the protected zone of any protected tree.
13. In general, take such steps as necessary to protect roots, bark, trunk, branches and leaves from injury during construction.
14. Monitor protected trees for drought stress throughout construction and irrigate as needed to maintain health.
15. Maintain three inches of natural leaf litter beneath the dripline of each protected tree. Use approved organic mulch if leaf litter is not available.
16. No herbicides shall be used within 100 feet of any protected tree unless approval is provided in writing by the Director of Public Works.
17. No tools, equipment, materials, vehicles, debris, paint, concrete, mortar, cement, stucco, paint, solvent, excess soil or other foreign materials shall be placed within the protected zone of any protected tree at any time, except as authorized by the Director of Public works.
18. Any approved excavation within the protected zone of any protected tree shall be performed with hand tools only under the direct observation of the designated project arborist at all times. Light construction equipment may be used with the written approval of the Director of Public Works.
19. Excavate and tunnel beneath roots one-inch in diameter and greater where feasible. Roots to be removed shall be pruned with a sharp pruning tool at the edge of the excavation. Cover temporarily exposed roots with moist burlap until backfill occurs.

**Mitigation Measures 11-19**

**Monitoring Action:** Site inspection  
**Timing:** During any construction related activities, including but not limited to demolition, site preparation, grading, or building construction.  
**Responsibility:** Director of Public Works

20. Applicant will employ the Arborist of Record (AOR) for professional arboricultural services for further advice and oversight of this project. A signed copy of the AOR contract will be submitted as part of the approval process.
21. All site development plans, including grading, planting and irrigation and their installation(s) will be reviewed and approved by the AOR prior to the start of construction and are subject to approval by the Public Works Department.
22. A grading plan, approved by the AOR, will be submitted as an addendum to city approved tree report as part of the conditions of final approval.
23. Any changes or addendums to the approved plans will be reviewed and approved, in writing, by the AOR.

**Mitigation Measures 20-23**

**Monitoring Action:** Plan review

**Timing:** Prior to issuance of development permits  
**Responsibility:** Arborist of Record; Public Works Department

- 24. All approved pruning of canopy and/or cutting of roots shall be performed under the direct supervision of the project AOR in accordance with The Pruning Standards of the Western Chapter of the International Society of Arboriculture.
- 25. All recommendations contained in the approved arborist report will be adhered to carefully. All work within the protected zone of affected trees will be directed by the AOR.
- 26. The AOR will notify the City of any unsatisfactory conditions or of any non-compliance issues with conditions of approval or Indigenous Tree permit conditions. Site monitoring is required and will be supported by regular, written reports submitted to the City of Glendale Public Works Division as a condition of approval. Due to pre-construction utility work by GWP within the critical root zone of the city owned Western sycamore tree within the public right-of-way relative to this sites development, the sycamore street tree will be included in the monitoring reports for the duration of this project.

**Mitigation Measures 24-26**

**Monitoring Action:** Site Inspection  
**Timing:** During any construction related activities, including but not limited to demolition, site preparation, grading, or building construction.  
**Responsibility:** Arborist of Record

- 27. The temporary fencing installation shall be maintained until written authorization is received for relocation or removal from the Director of Public Works.
- 28. City will require post-construction monitoring of protected trees and the applicant must plant new indigenous trees to replace any that die as a result of impacts from construction. The AOR will prepare a Monitoring Plan for the indigenous tree(s) impacted by this project, and will conduct all post-monitoring inspections. Frequency for all inspections will be at the discretion of the Urban Forester, which will be based on findings of the AOR's last report and approved Monitoring Plan, and determined at the end of the project, but before final sign-off.

**Mitigation Measures 27-28**

**Monitoring Action:** Site Inspection  
**Timing:** Upon completion of the project prior to final of building permit  
**Responsibility:** Director Public Works; Arborist of Record; Urban Forester

- 2) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

**No Impact.** A review of the City's Primary and Secondary Ridgeline Study indicates that no blue line streams are located on or near the project site. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present on the site or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 3) ***Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

**No Impact.** No federally protected wetlands are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 4) **Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is located in a developed area where there are many constraints to wildlife movement under the existing condition. Existing development in the area and associated fencing severely limit wildlife movement. Consequently, wildlife movement on the project site is limited to only local movement of wildlife within the immediate vicinity. The proposal to construction a new single-family residence would not result in any significant barrier to wildlife moving through the area since the majority of the 1.86 acre project site will remain in its natural state. Therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated.** The Glendale Municipal Code, Section 12.44 specifically protects six different native or "indigenous" species of trees that include the Coast live oak, Valley oak, Mesa oak, Scrub oak, California sycamore, and California bay. There are oak trees and a Sycamore located in the northern portion of the site and within 20 feet of the site. The urban forester has reviewed plans and arborist report submitted by the applicant for this project. Indigenous tree mitigation measures were recommended as a means of mitigating any potential environmental impacts to the protected trees on and within 20 feet of the subject site. Compliance with these measures would ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** Implementation of mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and Response D-1 above would reduce impacts on the existing trees to less than significant levels.

- 6) **Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

**No Impact.** No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan has been adopted to include the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any such plans. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**E. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

| <b>Would the project:</b>   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?    |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| geologic feature?  |                                       |  |                                     |                  |
| 4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |

1) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

**No Impact.** The project site is currently undeveloped but surrounded on three sides by single family residences. Because the site is undeveloped, no impacts to a historical resource would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the local area. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources and result in a significant impact. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius (328 feet) must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement no significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. Nonetheless, there is a possibility that paleontological resources may exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the proposed project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the proposed project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius (328 feet) must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement no significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) **Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. Nonetheless, if human remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then

serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or reburial). With implementation of this standard requirement no significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |                                |   | X                            |           |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| iv) Landslides?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?  |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?   |                                |   |                              | X         |

1) **Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**

i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** According to the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the subject site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. Therefore, impacts from the rupture of a seismic fault are considered to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

---

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site could be subject to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake originating along one of the faults listed as active or potentially active in the Southern California area. This hazard exists throughout Southern California and could pose a risk to public safety and property by exposing people, property, or infrastructure to potentially adverse effects, including strong seismic ground shaking. Compliance with applicable building codes would minimize structural damage to buildings and ensure safety in the event of a moderate or major earthquake. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

iii) ***Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?***

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an area prone to liquefaction as indicated in the City's Safety Element (August 2003). In addition, according to the Geological Investigation prepared by Coast Geotechnical, Inc. on February 11, 2013, the site is not in an area that may contain liquefiable materials. Thus, liquefaction is considered unlikely. Therefore, no impacts associated with liquefaction would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

iv) ***Landslides?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The subject property is located in San Rafael Hills. The southeasterly portion of the project site and immediate area are located within a landslide or landslide hazard zone area, as indicated by the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). The area where the residence is proposed, however, is not located in either zone. According to the Safety Element, all of the landslides mapped within City limits are relatively small in area, and limited to the Verdugo Mountains and San Rafael Hills. No Significant landslide impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project could result in exposure of onsite soils during construction, since the project site is located on a hillside with elevation differences that require grading. The proposed plan for the new house will require 1,500 cubic yards of grading, with approximately 1,000 cubic yards of cut and 500 cubic yards of fill. Soils on the project site would only be exposed for a limited amount of time during site preparation activities and substantial erosion is not expected to occur. An erosion control plan, subject to review and approval by the City Engineer, will be required prior to any construction-related activities. Such plans must include procedures and equipment necessary to contain onsite soils and minimize potential for contaminated runoff from the construction site. As a result, impacts from soil erosion are anticipated to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an onsite or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Subsidence is the process of lowering the elevation of an area of the earth's surface and can be caused by tectonic forces deep within the earth or by consolidation and densification of sediments sometimes due to withdrawal of fluids such as groundwater. The project site is not located in an area of significant subsidence activity and would not include fluid withdrawal or removal. In addition, as indicated in Response F-1 (iii), above, the soil under the

project site is not prone to liquefaction. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soil are anticipated to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) **Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

**No Impact.** As indicated in the Soils Investigation prepared by AllStar Engineering Group, dated March 2, 2013, the site contains "fill soils overlying native soils and bedrock." The project site is not located on expansive soil. No impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

5) **Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project site will be connected to the City's sewer system. No septic tanks will be utilized as part of the project. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?                    |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 2. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? |                                |   | X                            |           |

1) **Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** 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. This project is consistent with Greener Glendale Strategies to reduce GHGs. Therefore, it is determined that the project would result in less than cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emission and no mitigation is required.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) **Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** For the reasons discussed in Response G-1 above, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                                   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site? |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for  |                                |   |                              | X         |

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| people residing or working in the project site?  |                                       |  |                                     |                  |
| 7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |

- 1) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project involves the construction of a new 2-story single-family residence on an undeveloped lot. The development of a single-family residence does not involve any use, routine transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. No new hazardous materials will be generated at the site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 2) **Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rule 403 and 402, during the construction phase of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. No significant impacts are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 3) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**No Impact.** The nearest school, Glenoaks Elementary School, is located at 2015 East Glenoaks Boulevard Glendale, CA 91206, approximately ¾ miles southwest of the project. However, the project would not emit any new hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials since the proposal is to construct a new single-family residence. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 4) **Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 6) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project site?**

**No Impact.** No private airstrips are located in the city of Glendale or in the vicinity of the project site. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any safety hazards for people residing on the project site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 7) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

**No Impact.** East Chevy Chase Drive is identified in the Safety Element (August 2003) as a City Disaster Response Route. The proposed project does not involve any changes to streets nor would the project result in the alteration of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. As such, no impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would occur.

- 8) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project is located within a "Fire Hazard Area" and would be required to comply with Glendale Fire Department (GFD) brush clearance requirements. The brush clearance requirements call for the removal of continuous stands of brush and all dead vegetation 100 feet from any structure. The project will be required to comply with the GFD brush clearance requirements throughout the life of the project. In addition, the landscape plans will require approval from GFD prior to issuance of permits. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

I. **HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  |                                |   | X                            |           |

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 4. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 5. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?  |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?  |                                       |  |                                     | X                |

1) ***Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste water discharge requirements. Under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct storm water discharges. In Glendale, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges, including construction activities. Implementation of the proposed project will require compliance with all the NPDES requirements including the submittal and certification of plans and details showing both construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are integrated into the design of the project. The submittal of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) approved by the City Engineer will also be required to be integrated into the design of the project. Impacts related to water quality are considered to be less than significant with the compliance of all applicable permitting requirements.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** The proposed project involves construction of a 4,143 square-foot two-story single-family residence, an attached three-car garage and detached 500 square-foot guest house. The subject site is 1.86 acres in area. The building footprints, hardscape and driveways will

total approximately 16 percent of the lot area. As recommended in the arborist's report, some of the driveway will be permeable, further increasing the ability of groundwater to be recharged. The remainder of the site will remain as landscaped area or undisturbed open space. As a result, the project would not substantially interfere with groundwater recharge. In addition, the project does not involve additions or withdrawals of groundwater. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 3) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The residence will be located near the center of the lot and will be over 100 feet from the street front property lines along Chevy Chase Drive and Lair Road. Currently, water which falls on the site is absorbed into the ground on-site or, because of the steep topography of the site, falls to either Chevy Chase Drive or Laird Road. The proposed residence will slightly modify the existing drainage pattern of the site. The method of discharge associated with the area proposed for development will require the approval of the City Engineer. Based on the scale of the proposed project, the project will not substantially alter the natural drainage of the site, and therefore, would not result in substantial increase in runoff. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 4) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response 1-3 above.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) ***Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** The amount of impervious surfaces would slightly increase as a result of the new residence and will slightly increase runoff from the site compared with existing conditions. Since only approximately 16 percent of the lot area will become impervious surface, and some of the driveway will use a permeable surface as recommended by the arborist's report, the increase in impervious surface area is minimal compared with the overall lot size. As a result, impacts from runoff are anticipated to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 6) ***Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response 1-3 above.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 7) ***Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

**No Impact.** According to Federal Emergency Management Agency flood hazard maps, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 8) ***Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

**No Impact.** As indicated in Response I-7 above, the project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 9) **Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

**No Impact.** According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within inundation zones from failure of upstream dams. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 10) **Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?**

**No Impact.** Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by sudden water displacement caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption. A review of the County of Los Angeles Flood and Inundation Hazards Map indicates that the site is not within the mapped tsunami inundation boundaries. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**J. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Physically divide an established community?  |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 2. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?   |                                |   |                              | X         |

- 1) **Physically divide an established community?**

**No Impact.** The project site is located on an undeveloped property. The proposed project includes the development of a new two-story single-family residence, attached garage and guest house. The site is surrounded by other existing single-family residences. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 2) **Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The existing zoning designation on the project site is R1R (Restricted Residential) and the General Plan designation is Low Density Residential. The proposed use complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The City's zoning code requires approval of a conditional use permit when a new residence is proposed on a lot which exceeds 50 percent average current slope and proposes more than 1,500 cubic yards of grading. The average

current slope of the site is 56 percent. Grading quantities are projected to be 1,000 cubic yards of cut and 500 cubic yards of fill. Therefore, development of the project requires approval of a conditional use permit. The purpose of the conditional use permit is to allow special consideration for certain uses to be located in zones other than those in which they are classified as permitted because of their particular characteristics. Such uses may only be suitable in specific locations in a zoning classification or only if such uses are designed or laid out in a particular manner on the site or are subjected to specific conditions to assure compatibility within the zone and its surroundings. The proposed project is the construction of a single-family house located in a single-family zone. The proposed residence will be located on the lower part of the property near an existing roadway that was graded some time ago. This location minimizes the amount of new grading and reduces potential visual impacts related to the development. A less than significant impact would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) **Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?**

**No Impact.** There is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan in the project site or vicinity. As such, the implementation of the proposed project could not conflict with any such plans. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

K. MINERAL RESOURCES

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? |                                |   | X                            |           |

1) **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located in an area containing mineral deposits the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). Although data evaluating deposits is not available, the project site is zoned for residential use and single-family homes are located north and west of the site. Additionally, the area has been previously subdivided. A less than significant impact would occur as a result of the project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) **Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response K-1 above.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

L. NOISE

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 2. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 3. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 4. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels? |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?  |                                       |  |                                     | X                |

1) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project involves construction of a new single-family residence. This is a permitted use on the subject site, which is zoned R1R. Surrounding land uses include other single-family residences and open space. As shown on the City's Noise Element, the project site is located within a noise contour below 60 CNEL, which is normally acceptable. The development of a single-family residence on this site would not generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. No significant impacts are anticipated.

2) ***Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Excessive groundborne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operations, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The project will not require any blasting activities and any earth movement associated with project construction will not require pile driving. Therefore, the project is not expected to generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

**No Impact.** The project involves the development of a single-family residence and would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise. This use is consistent with the surrounding uses in the area. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Short-term noise impacts could occur as a result of construction activities. All development within the project site will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or from 7:00 p.m. on Saturday to 7:00 a.m. on Monday or from 7:00 p.m. preceding a holiday. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would ensure that no significant impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?***

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 6) ***For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project site to excessive noise levels?***

**No Impact.** There are no private airstrips located on or within the vicinity of the project site. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**M. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 3. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   |                                |   |                              | X         |

- 1) ***Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

**No Impact.** The project involves the construction of a new single-family residence, consistent with adjoining development along Chevy Chase Drive. The subject site is zoned R1R, Floor Area District II with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Low Density Residential. The proposed single-family residence is consistent with the permitted uses for this zone; therefore, it is not considered growth inducing. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) **Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** No existing housing will be removed as part of the project since the subject lot is currently undeveloped. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) **Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

**No Impact.** No residential units exist on the subject site; therefore, no residential population will be displaced. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**N. PUBLIC SERVICES**

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: |                                |   |                              |           |
| a) Fire protection?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| b) Police protection?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| c) Schools?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| d) Parks?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| e) Other public facilities?   |                                |   |                              | X         |

1) **Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

a) **Fire protection?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The nearest fire station is Station 23 located at 3303 E. Chevy Chase Drive, approximately ½ mile from the project site. The project will require compliance with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the GFD at the time building permits are submitted for approval. In addition, future residents will be required to comply with GFD brush clearance requirements. Impacts to fire protection are anticipated to be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

b) **Police protection?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police services to the project site. The nearest police facility is located at 131 North Isabel Street. The overall need for police protection services are not expected to increase significantly as a result of the proposed project. The GPD did not cite concerns related to police protection regarding the proposed project. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

c) **Schools?**

**Less than Significant Impact.** The applicant will be required to pay a development fee pursuant to Government Code Section 65995 to the Glendale Unified School District prior to development of the proposed project. This section provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per square foot basis for new commercial development to assist in the construction of or addition to schools. Payment of these fees is declared by the California State Legislature, under the provisions of Government Code Section 65995.5 to be sufficient and necessary mitigation of impacts. No significant impacts are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

d) **Parks?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The property is zoned for single-family residential use and was not planned for use as a park. The proposed project would not contribute to additional need for parks. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

e) **Other public facilities?**

**No Impact.** The project site is undeveloped and zoned for single-family use. The applicant is proposing to construct one single-family residential dwelling consistent with development in the project area. The proposed residence is located in an area of the city intended for single-family residence. As a result, the proposed project can be adequately served by existing public facilities. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

O. **RECREATION**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?                        |                                       |  |                                     | X                |

- 1) ***Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is undeveloped and zoned for single-family use. The applicant is proposing to construct one single-family residential dwelling. The subject property is located in an area that is developed with other single-family residences and is not anticipated to significantly increase the demand on existing parks. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 2) ***Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

**No Impact.** No recreation facilities or expansion of existing facilities are proposed as a part of the project. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

P. **TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 2. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?   |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?  |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 5. Result in inadequate emergency access?  |                                       | X  |                                     |                  |
| 6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?   |                                       |  |                                     | X                |

- 1) ***Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

**Less than Significant Impact.** There would be a temporary increase in day time traffic as a result of construction activities. A traffic control plan will be required for project construction. Approval of the plan would ensure that potential impacts of trucks associated with grading would be reduced to less than significant levels. The proposed project would result in a net increase of one single-family residence above the current condition. A slight increase in the number of vehicles using the area streets (approximately 10 daily trips) is anticipated to create a less than significant impact.

- 2) ***Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?***

**No Impact.** As discussed above in Response P-1, the proposed project would not result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 3) **Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within the vicinity of a private air strip. No impacts on air traffic patterns would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 4) **Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Access to the property will be taken from Laird Drive, which is a local street, and from Chevy Chase Drive, which is a Community Collector. The City will ensure as part of the construction process that streets will not be obstructed by construction equipment or supplies. No impacts to emergency access would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 6) **Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding alternative transportation since no changes to the existing transportation policies, plans, or programs would result from project implementation. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**Q. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 3. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?          |                                |   |                              | X         |

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   |                                       |  |                                     | X                |

1) ***Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?***

**No Impact.** Construction work associated with the proposed project as well as project operation would be required to comply with all applicable wastewater treatment requirements included NPDES and Best Management Practices (BMPs). No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

2) ***Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

**No Impact.** The proposed project would result in a net increase of one residential dwelling unit. The proposed project is not anticipated to substantially increase the demand for new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the need to expand existing facilities. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

**No Impact.** As Indicated in Response Q-2 above, the project involves an increase in one residential unit. The addition of a single-family house is not expected to substantially increase the demand for new storm water drainage facilities or the need to expand existing facilities or the construction of new facilities. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Water would be provided to the project site via existing supply lines adjacent to the project site. Adequate water exists to serve the proposed project. The proposed project will be required to comply with the Hillside Landscape Guidelines as well as planting of drought tolerant and California-friendly landscape. No significant impacts to the availability of water are anticipated.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 5) **Result In a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project would not create a significant increase in the generation of wastewater and will comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to wastewater. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 6) **Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The majority of solid waste generated in the City of Glendale is transported to Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City. An ordinance passed by the City of Glendale limits disposal at the landfill to solid wastes generated within the Los Angeles County incorporated Cities of Glendale, La Canada Flintridge, Pasadena, South Pasadena, San Marino, Sierra Madre; the Los Angeles County unincorporated communities known as Altadena, La Crescenta, Montrose; the unincorporated area bordered by the Cities of San Gabriel, Rosemead, Temple City, Arcadia, and Pasadena; the unincorporated area immediately to the north of Arcadia, and Pasadena; and the unincorporated area immediately to the north of the City of San Marino bordered by the City of Pasadena on the west, north and east sides.

Scholl Canyon Landfill has the capacity to accept solid waste until January 2019. Solid waste generation is expected to increase during the construction phase of the project as well as when the future residents move into the single-family residence. However, the existing solid waste system would be sufficient to accommodate waste generated by the project. No significant impacts to solid waste facilities are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

- 7) **Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

**No Impact.** The proposed project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations relating to solid waste. All construction debris will be disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local statutes. No impacts would occur.

**Mitigation Measures:** No mitigation measures are required.

**R. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. 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? |                                | X   |                              |           |
| 2. 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  |                                |   |                              | X         |

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?  |                                       |  |                                     |                  |
| 3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? |                                       |  |                                     | X                |

- 1) ***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?***

**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation.** With the Mitigation Measures proposed in Biological Resources, impacts to plant communities are anticipated to a Less Than Significant Level. No other impacts are anticipated to occur to the quality of the environment, fish or wildlife habitats, fish or wildlife populations, animal communities, or to rare, threatened or endangered plant and animal species as a result of the proposed project. No impacts to cultural resources would occur.

- 2) ***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)?***

**No Impact.** Development of the proposed project will not substantially increase traffic nor would it result in a substantial increase in population as this is a single-family residential development. Public facilities are available to accommodate the slight increase in usage due to project development. No impacts would occur.

- 3) ***Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

**No Impact.** Development of the proposed project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans. No impacts would occur.

13. **Earlier Analyses**

None

14. **Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist**

One or more of the following references were incorporated into the Initial Study by reference, and are available for review in the Planning Division Office, 633 E. Broadway, Rm. 103, Glendale, CA 91206-4386. Items used are referred to by number on the Initial Study Checklist.

1. Environmental Information Form application and materials submitted on September 4, 2013.
2. The City of Glendale's General Plan, as amended.
3. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
4. "Guidelines of the City of Glendale for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended," August 19, 2003, City of Glendale Planning Division.

5. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
6. "CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook," updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
7. Soils Report, AllStar Engineering Group, March 2, 2013.
8. Geologic Investigation, Coast Geotechnical, Inc., February 11, 2013