



CITY OF GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

AGENDA ITEM

Report: Public Hearing on Appeal of Historic Preservation Commission's denial of Design Review Case No. PDR-000838-2023 located at 1642 South Central Avenue and 1608 Gardena Avenue.

1. Resolution certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed Project, adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) due to significant and unavoidable project impacts from (i) the demolition of the existing historic house at 1642 S. Central Avenue, and (ii) construction generated noise and vibration impacts and making findings in support thereof; and adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).
2. Motion approving the Project Design Review Application (DR Case No. PDR2017612) as proposed.
3. Motion approving the Project Design Review Application (DR Case No. PDR2017612) with conditions.
4. Motion to sustain the Historic Preservation Commission's decision to not certify the FEIR and deny the Project Design Review Application.

COUNCIL ACTION

Item Type: Public Hearing

Approved for _____ **April 11, 2023** **calendar**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This hearing is to consider an appeal of the Historic Preservation Commission's (HPC) February 16, 2023 denial of a Design Review Application and decision to not certify the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for a new five-story, 31-unit, affordable rental housing project on a 9,958 square-foot lot zoned SFMU (Commercial/Residential Mixed Use), with three units reserved for very low income households and a concession to reduce the total amount of parking spaces by two parking spaces (16 parking spaces provided in a one-level subterranean garage; 18 parking spaces required), per Gov. Code Density Bonus Incentive (the "Project").

On January 19, 2023, the HPC initially reviewed the Project and voted to “Return for Redesign” to not include the demolition of the house at 1642 South Central Avenue that was built in 1913.

On January 26, 2023, the applicant resubmitted a Project Design Review application without any changes to the project.

On February 16, 2023, the HPC denied the Project and did not certify the FEIR.

On February 26, 2023, the applicant filed an appeal requesting the City Council to reverse the HPC’s denial of the Project Design Review Application, and to certify the FEIR, adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations due to significant and unavoidable project impacts from (i) the demolition of the existing historic house at 1642 S. Central Avenue, and (ii) construction generated noise and vibration impacts and making findings in support thereof; and adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

COUNCIL PRIORITIES

Housing: The Project (as proposed) can contribute to the health of the City through an economically viable infill project that would provide an increase in residential units (31 units total; 3 reserved for very low income households) to help meet housing demand in the City and better meet the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) requirements for the region.

RECOMMENDATION

That the City Council certify the FEIR and either approve the project as proposed, approve the project with conditions, approve one of the Project Alternatives described and analyzed in the FEIR.

If the City Council certifies the FEIR for one of the Project alternatives not involving demolition of 1642 S. Central, that alternative will not require adoption of Statement of Overriding Considerations (SOC) based on significant and unavoidable impacts regarding historic resources; however, will be require adoption of SOC based on significant and unavoidable impacts concerning construction generated noise and vibration impacts.

BACKGROUND

Appellant: Aram Alajajian

Status of Appellant 1: Applicant

Assessor’s Parcel Number: 5640-029-014

Zone: SFMU (San Fernando Commercial/Residential Mixed Use) Zone

Land Use Element: Mixed Use

Existing Site Characteristics: The northwest portion of the property is developed with a single family Craftsman style dwelling constructed in 1913 (“1642 S. Central”). The southeast portion of the property is developed with a smaller single family house built circa 1923 (“1608 Gardena”) and a garage/accessory building also built in 1923 (Garage). The subject lot is zoned SFMU (San Fernando Commercial/Residential Mixed Use), is approximately 9,958 square-feet, and is located at the southeast corner of South Central Avenue and Gardena Avenue in the Tropico neighborhood and South Glendale Community Plan (SGCP) area. The properties to the immediate north and west of the Project site are developed with industrial uses, single-family residences are located to the south, and the Larry Zarian Transportation Center to the west.

An Historic Context Statement for the South Glendale Community Plan Area (“Context Statement”) was prepared in 2014 by Historic Resources Group (HRG). This Context Statement identified a theme of Early Development & Town Settlement (1872-1919) for properties associated with the early history of Glendale and Tropico. The 1913 construction date of the Craftsman home located at 1642 S. Central places it within the Early Development & Town Settlement historical context theme for its association with development in the former City of Tropico.

The 1608 Gardena residence and the garage, both built circa 1923, are associated with development during the Pre-World War II Automobile Suburbs (1919-1944). In 2018, HRG prepared the South Glendale Historic Resources Survey (“Survey”) and identified the Craftsman house located at 1642 S. Central property as appearing eligible for listing in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources (Status Code 5S3). The Survey found the 1642 S. Central Craftsman house to be “an increasingly rare example of early residential development in Tropico,” which links it to the broad cultural, social, and historic heritage predating Tropico’s annexation into the City of Glendale. According to the Survey, the house located at 1642 S. Central is considered an excellent example of the Craftsman style, possessing many of the style’s character-defining features and including other, more rare, stylistic elements; this residence reflects the creative impulses of early designers working in what at the time was a relatively new style, along with the aesthetic tastes and social goals of early Glendale area residents.

The Survey recognized a difference between earlier Craftsman-style properties built before 1919 and those built in subsequent years until the style fell out of popular use around 1925. The earlier buildings, such 1642 S. Central, displayed greater stylistic experimentation and a wider range of character defining features, while the later ones, like 1608 Gardena, typically reflect a more standardized expression of the style. The Survey did not include 1608 Gardena or the Garage as part of its assessment because, although located on the same lot, these buildings do not possess the level of Craftsman detail that would warrant their inclusion. Based on the registration requirements established in the Context Statement, and the methodology of the Survey, Planning

Staff has determined that 1608 Gardena and the Garage do not contribute to the historic character of the property and have not acquired any historic significance in their own right.

Based on the Survey findings and staff's assessment of the entire site, 1642 South Central Avenue is a historic resource, and its demolition will cause a substantial adverse change to the environment as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5. The demolition of the 1608 Gardena and the Garage will not create a significant impact because they neither contribute to the significance of 1642 S. Central nor are they individually eligible for historic designation.

On August 10, 2018, the prior property owner submitted a Demolition Clearance Request to clear the entire property in anticipation of a future project. The Director of Community Development denied the request because the potential project involved the demolition of a historic resource and would therefore require preparation of an EIR to assess environmental impacts. The owner appealed this decision to City Council, and on June 11, 2019, the City Council upheld the Director's decision denying the Demolition Clearance request and directed the applicant to prepare an EIR.

Surrounding Land Use/Zoning: The project site is surrounded by IMU-R zoned properties with commercial/industrial uses to the north and west, SFMU zoned properties with commercial uses to the east, single-family residences to the south, and the Larry Zarian Transportation Center to the west.

	Zoning	Existing Uses
North	IMU-R – (Industrial/Commercial-Residential Mixed Use) Zone	Commercial/Industrial
South	SFMU – Commercial/Residential Mixed Use	Single-family residential
East	SFMU – Commercial/Residential Mixed Use	Commercial
West	SFMU – Commercial/Residential Mixed Use, and T - Transportation	Larry Zarian Transportation Center
Project Site	SFMU – Commercial/Residential Mixed Use	Multi-family residential

Environmental Determination: As required by the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal Code Regs §15082(a)(1)), the City issued a Notice of Preparation for a Draft Environmental

Impact Report (DEIR) for the Proposed Project on June 10, 2021. The Project DEIR was circulated for public review and comment from March 24, 2022, through April 22, 2022, and based on public comments, the City prepared a Partially Recirculated Draft EIR (PR-DEIR) to expand upon the DEIR's noise and vibration impact analysis. Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15087 and 15088.5(d), the PR-DEIR was circulated for a 30-day public comment period beginning on August 12, 2022. Public comments were received during the public review periods for both the DEIR and PR-DEIR, and responses to each comment were included in the FEIR.

The FEIR was prepared pursuant to the City of Glendale's Procedures for Preparation and Processing of Environmental Documents (Glendale CEQA Guidelines, 2016), Public Resources Code §§21000 et seq., and the State CEQA Guidelines (15 Cal Code Regs §15000 et seq.). The FEIR was published on the City's website on December 2, 2022. The FEIR (which includes the DEIR and PR-DEIR) and proposed Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) are attached as Exhibit 1.

The FEIR addresses the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. The scope of the FEIR includes environmental issues determined to be potentially significant by the Notice of Preparation (NOP), responses to the NOP, consulting staff, and the City of Glendale. The NOP identified potentially significant impacts on the following issue areas associated with the implementation of the proposed Project, which are discussed in detail in the FEIR:

- Cultural Resources
- Noise and Vibration

The FEIR addresses the issues referenced above and identifies significant environmental impacts. In addition, the FEIR recommends feasible mitigation measures and project alternatives, that were selected because they meet most of the Project objectives, while reducing the Project's significant environmental effects.

Summary of Project Impacts

As summarized in Chapter 1 of the FEIR, the proposed Project would result in the following significant and unavoidable project-related and/or cumulative impacts.

Cultural Resources

- The proposed Project would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Noise and Vibration

- Construction of the proposed Project would generate a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies.
- Construction of the proposed Project would generate excessive ground-borne vibration levels.

Alternatives to the Proposed Project

Alternative 1: No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the two residential dwellings on the lot located at 1642 South Central Avenue and 1608 Gardena, and the existing garage, would be retained in their current configuration and would not be disturbed; no construction would occur on site and the current residential uses would continue. No new residential uses would be added. The existing physical features of the Project site, including the character-defining features of the historic resource, would not change and no modifications, repairs, or restoration would be made.

The No Project Alternative assumes that the Project would not be approved and would result in a “no build” scenario wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. If the No Project Alternative were to proceed, no changes would be implemented and none of the impacts associated with the Project would occur. However, incremental changes would be expected to occur in the vicinity of the Project site as nearby projects are approved, constructed, and occupied. With no change to existing site conditions under the No Project Alternative, land use activity on the Project site would not contribute to cumulative impacts beyond existing levels. There would be no construction or operational impacts related to noise and vibration compared to the Project. Since the No Project Alternative would retain all the character-defining features of the subject property and not demolish or make any modifications to the historic resource, it would not cause any material impairment to the historic resource. Compared to the Project, which would demolish all buildings on site and result in material impairment to the historic resource, the No Project Alternative would not result in any project-level impacts and would not contribute to any impacts related to historic architectural resources. The No Project Alternative would not require construction activities and would not result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction noise and vibration.

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed five-story multi-family five-story residential building containing 31 units of rental housing, including three very-low income units, and a one-level subterranean garage would not be constructed. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives.

Alternative 2: Reduced Density and Relocation on Site

The Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) Alternative (“Alternative 2”) would relocate 1642 S. Central Avenue residential building within the Project site, demolish 1608 Gardena, and the garage, and construct a reduced number of residential units on the remaining site area. The house located at 1642 S. Central would be moved to the north within the existing project site, with a 10-foot setback from South Central Avenue. This relocation would leave a remaining buildable area of approximately 4,433 square feet (0.1017 acre) on the Project site. For SFMU zoned properties, the maximum allowable density is 100 units per acre. The remaining buildable area would allow for 10.178 units (11 units). At a 35 percent density bonus, Alternative 2 would add four additional units to accommodate a reduced maximum allowable density project of fifteen (15) residential units, including approximately fourteen (14) market-rate and one (1) very low-income units instead of the Proposed Project’s thirty-one (31) units. Alternative 2 would provide an estimated eight subterranean parking spaces. The approximate 15 unit and 8 parking space configuration is the maximum allowable density by the Zoning Code and the potential amount of parking spaces that could be constructed at the remaining buildable area to satisfy other various code requirements, such as, compliant interior/exterior circulation within/and around the building, landscaping, open space, driveway ramps and turning radius within the garage. Alternative 2 would require construction of similar improvements, including grading and construction of the footings, connections for utilities, however the construction activities would be of shorter duration.

The on-site relocation and restoration of the historic building would involve various restoration activities that would be required to comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation (CEQA Guidelines section 15331). As such, depending on other features of the Project, the on-site relocation and building restoration may be eligible for categorical exemption under CEQA.

Alternative 2 would result in fewer environmental impacts compared to the Project given the reduced scale and shorter duration of the construction. Alternative 2 would also be consistent with the SFMU and Mixed-Use District General Development Standards. The 15-unit building with a one-level subterranean garage would have a smaller building footprint than the 31-unit Project but would still result in short-term impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, geology/soils, water quality, and traffic. Similar to the Project, these short-term construction impacts from this Alternative would be less than significant and typical of small in fill land development projects where compliance with existing codes and other regulatory standards ensure these types of impacts are below impact thresholds. As previously noted, Alternative 2 would require a shorter construction duration but would not result in a significant reduction in construction noise compared to the Project.

As noted in the FEIR, the site preparation and grading construction phases generate the highest noise levels because earthmoving equipment is the noisiest construction

equipment. This work would still be required but the timing would be shortened due to the reduced size of the proposed building. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control and Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Construction Vibration Control would ensure that construction noise and vibration is reduced to the lowest feasible level. However, impacts related to construction noise and vibration would remain significant and unavoidable because of the close proximity of a sensitive receptor.

Alternative 2 would preserve the on-site location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and character-defining features of 1642 S. Central. While the historic house would be preserved, as with the Project, this alternative would modify the setting of the historic resource. This alternative would, however, eliminate the significant and unavoidable impact that would result from the demolition of 1642 S. Central Avenue.

Alternative 3: Reduced Density and No Relocation (keep the historic house located at 1642 South Central Avenue in its existing location on the project site)

The Reduced Density (Existing Location) Alternative ("Alternative 3") would result in fewer environmental impacts compared to the Project because it would retain the historic house located at 1642 S. Central at its original location, as well as lead to a significantly smaller building (eleven residential units versus 31 units), and a shorter construction duration. Like Alternative 2, the approximate eleven unit and eight parking space configuration is the maximum allowable density by the Zoning Code and the potential amount of parking spaces that could be constructed at the remaining buildable area to satisfy other various code requirements, such as, compliant interior/exterior circulation within/and around the building, landscaping, open space, driveway ramps and turning radius within the garage. Due to the approximately 1/3 size of this Alternative compared to the Project and shorter duration of construction, this Alternative would result in reduced environmental impacts compared to the Project. Alternative 3 would also be consistent with the SFMU and Mixed-Use District General Development Standards. The eleven-unit building with a one-level subterranean garage would have a smaller building footprint compared to the Project but would still result in some short-term, but less than significant impacts to air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, geology/soils, water quality, and traffic. Similar to the Project, these short-term construction impacts would be less than significant and typical of small land development projects.

Alternative 3 would result in reduced construction duration compared to the Project. However, the site preparation and grading construction phases, which generate the highest noise levels, would still be required. The timing of this work would be shortened due to the reduced size of the proposed building. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance and implementation of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control and Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Construction Vibration Control would ensure that construction noise and vibration is reduced to the maximum amount feasible. However, impacts related to construction noise and vibration would remain significant and unavoidable because of the close proximity of a sensitive receptor.

Alternative 3 would preserve the existing location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and character-defining features of the house located at 1642 S. Central. The retention of the house at its existing location would eliminate the Project's significant impact resulting from the demolition of the resource although it would still alter the immediate setting, such alteration is not a significant impact that materially impairs the ability of the house to convey its historicity: The residential dwelling at 1642 S. Central Avenue would remain an excellent example of a Craftsman style house and would remain eligible for listing on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources under Criterion 3.

Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines require that an alternative, other than the project and the no-project alternative, be chosen as the Environmentally Superior Alternative from the alternatives included in the EIR. Alternatives are chosen based on their feasibility, ability to meet project objectives some or all of the project objectives, and because the alternative eliminate or lessen significant and unavoidable impacts.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 (e) (2), if the no project alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then an EIR is required to identify another environmentally superior alternative from among the alternatives evaluated if the Project has significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that best avoids or lessens any significant effects of the Project, even if the alternative would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives. The No Project Alternative is considered the overall environmentally superior alternative because it would represent a continuation of existing conditions on the Project site and would not result in any significant impacts associated with implementation of the Project. The No Project Alternative, however, would not meet any of the project objectives.

Alternative—2 - Reduced Density (Relocation on Site) - would be the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives evaluated because Alternative 2 would eliminate the significant and unavoidable adverse impact associated with demolition of 1642 S. Central Avenue. The construction noise and vibration impacts would remain significant and unavoidable, although they would be lessened when compared to the Project. This alternative would also meet more of the Project objectives of adding affordable housing and meeting the City's affordable housing goals, although not to the same extent as the Project since Alternative 3 would yield twenty (20) fewer new units than the Proposed Project.

Project History:

November 4, 2020

Density Bonus Housing Plan Case No. PDBP2005164 and Design Review Application PDR 2017612 were submitted.

June 10, 2021	Notice of Preparation for a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).
March 24, 2022	Project DEIR was circulated for public review and comment for 30 days beginning March 24, 2022, through April 22, 2022 (Exhibit 4).
August 22, 2022	A Partially Recirculated Draft EIR (PR-DEIR) was subsequently prepared to address public comments and expand upon the analysis in the DEIR, particularly pertaining to potential noise and vibration impacts (Exhibit 3).
December 2, 2022	Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) was published on the City's website (Exhibit 1).
January 19, 2023	Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) initially reviewed the Project and voted to "Return for Redesign" to not include the demolition of the house at 1642 South Central Avenue that was built in 1913.
January 26, 2023	Applicant resubmitted a Project Design Review application without any changes to the project.
February 16, 2023	HPC denied the Project and did not certify the FEIR.
February 26, 2023	Appeal was filed by the applicant requesting the City Council to reverse the HPC's denial, approve the Project Design Review Application and certify the FEIR (Exhibit 9).

ANALYSIS

Summary of HPC Discussions

On February 16, 2023, the Historic Preservation Commission considered the materials and exhibits relative to the Design Review application and FEIR. Since 1642 South Central Avenue was found to be an increasingly rare example of early residential development in Tropico, HPC did not support the Project because it involves demolition of a historic resource. HPC denied certification of the FEIR and denied the Design Review application with a preference that the Project be redesigned with a reduced amount of density that would preserve 1642 South Central Avenue at its existing location on the site (e.g., Alternative 3). Soon after, and within 15 days the Historic Preservation Commission's decision, the applicant submitted an appeal.

Summary of HPC's Comments:

- **Do motions #5 and #6 outlined by the February 16, 2023 staff report (both with the determination of Return for Redesign) include the certification of the FEIR.**

- No. Motions #5 and #6 do not require the certification of the FEIR. Similar to HPC's January 19, 2023 "Return for Redesign" determination for the Design Review application, a CEQA determination is not required prior to returning a project for redesign, because such redesign may require modifications to the environmental review.
- **Who created the alternatives provided within the FEIR?**
 - The alternatives were selected by the EIR consultant in consultation with city staff. The methodology used to select alternatives to the Project for detailed CEQA analysis focused on developing a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that could avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts - while still meeting most of the Project's basic objectives. The EIR identified the demolition of 1642 South Central Avenue residence and all its character-defining features as a significant and unavoidable impact. As a result, project alternatives have been designed to avoid or substantially lessen this impact while still meeting most of the Project's basic objectives.
- **Correct the grammar of bullet point three of Mitigation Measure M-NO-1.**
 - The mitigation measure was amended to read, "The construction contractor shall place noise- and vibration-generating construction equipment, with exception to of equipment needed to complete shoring activities associated with the construction of the subterranean garage, away from sensitive uses. All construction staging areas shall be located away from sensitive uses." An Errata to the FEIR with all amended language are provided as Exhibit 8.
- **What is meant by vibration distance contours described within mitigation measures?**
 - The term vibration distance contour is used to describe the distance between the construction boundary and nearest off-site buildings to analyze potential construction vibration damage caused by various construction equipment.
- **What established (vibration) standard will be utilized by staff for vibration analysis refinement outlined by Mitigation Measure M-NO-2?**
 - While the Glendale Municipal Code provides thresholds for the potential for vibration annoyance, and not vibration damage, the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual for vibration damage will be used as part of staff's review.
- **As proposed, the Project is to construct a 31-unit residential building with three units (11 percent) reserved for very low income households. Will the**

remaining four percent be offset by an in lieu fee to satisfy the city's Inclusionary requirements?

- Glendale Municipal Code (GMC) 30.35, the Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance (the "IZO") requires a housing development (a rental development project of eight (8) or more dwelling units proposed to be constructed in the City) to provide fifteen percent (15%) of the units as affordable to low-income households. This Project is subject to the IZO and is required to provide four (4) affordable units to low income households (15 percent of 23 base density units (3.45 rounded up to 4)). Per GMC 30.35.060, developers of housing development projects may choose to pay a fee, or a combination of payment of a fee and the provision of units, in-lieu of providing all inclusionary units on site. While the Project proposes to reserve three units for low income households, the applicant has proposed to pay an in-lieu fee to meet remaining portion of the IZO requirement.
- **The project was resubmitted for the HPC's second review without any changes. Question was presented to the applicant if they were opposed to staff's recommended condition #1 to provide greater articulation at street facades.**
 - Applicant expressed its desire to not change the design at the street facades and maintain the aesthetic as proposed.
- **HPC Commissioner Jurca was troubled that the noise/vibration and EIR consultants were not available during the second meeting.**
 - The applicant has indicated that LSA, the consultant who authored the Noise and Vibration Study, will be present for the City Council meeting. The EIR consultant SWCA will be present at the City Council meeting.
- **Mitigation Measure M-NO-2 requires a "Vibration Analysis Refinement" which states, "Once the specific construction equipment list becomes available, potential vibration damage distance contours shall be refined." HPC Commissioner Jurca requested clarification as to why this is not deferred mitigation.**
 - Mitigation measures should describe the specific actions that will be taken to reduce or avoid an impact. It is ordinarily inappropriate to defer formulation of a mitigation measure to the future. 14 Cal Code Regs §15126.4(a)(1)(B). This rule is not absolute, and the courts have recognized exceptions to it in a number of situations. *POET, LLC v State Air Resources Bd.* (2013) 218 CA4th 681, 735. The CEQA Guidelines (as amended in 2018) acknowledge these exceptions, explaining that mitigation measures may specify performance standards for mitigating a significant impact when it is impractical or infeasible to specify the specific details of mitigation during the EIR review process, provided the lead agency commits to implement the

mitigation, adopts the specified performance standard, and identifies the types of actions that may achieve compliance with the performance standard. 14 Cal Code Regs §15126.4(a)(1)(B).

- Vibration Analysis Refinement is not considered deferred mitigation here because the analysis is required to be completed as part of the Building & Safety plan check review, and the project proponent is required to monitor construction activities in order to avoid or reduce any potential project-related construction vibration damage to adjacent buildings and/or structures and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the property owner is required to submit the construction vibration monitoring plan to the City for approval.

Mitigation measure M-NO-2: Construction Vibration Control ensures the vibration damage thresholds for construction projects do not exceed Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) thresholds and are evaluated for compliance prior to any permit issuance. Accordingly, Mitigation Measure M-NO-2 is not deferred mitigation.

- **If this project were to be appealed to the City Council, HPC requested that staff provide a full explanation of the reasons for making changes to the Noise and Vibration Study in the Partially Recirculation Environmental Impact Report.**
 - The City received two comments during the public comment period on the DEIR. These comments expressed concerns about the potential construction noise and vibration impacts on the dwelling (a converted garage) located to the southeast (1616 Gardena Avenue) of the Project. The comments brought new information to the attention of the Project proponent and City that implicated the need for additional construction noise and vibration impacts analysis in the Draft EIR. In response, the City has prepared and circulated a PR-DEIR in order to provide revised construction noise and vibration impact analysis.

The PR-DEIR included revisions to Section 3.2 *Noise and Vibration*, Chapter 4 *Alternatives*, and the *Mitigation and Monitoring Reporting Program* of the Draft EIR, to reflect the updated Noise and Vibration Study Report. These revisions are introduced in Chapter 1 of this PR-DEIR and are provided as Section 3.2 *Noise and Vibration* and Chapter 4 *Alternatives*, to follow the document numbering convention of the Draft EIR. Revised Section 3.2 *Noise and Vibration* and Chapter 4 *Alternatives* replace the corresponding sections of the Draft EIR in their entirety. In addition, updates to Section 1.4 *Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures* are presented after Section 3.2 *Noise and Vibration*. Appendix D has been replaced with the updated Noise and Vibration Study Report (2022). No changes were made to the following chapters of the Draft EIR: Chapter 1 *Introduction*, Chapter 2 *Project Description*, Chapter 3.1 *Cultural Resources*, Chapter 5 *Cumulative Impact Analysis*, and Chapter 6 *Other CEQA Considerations*.

- **HPC Commissioner Jurca commented her opinion that the cumulative impact analysis in the FEIR is inadequate.**

- By way of background, an EIR must discuss a cumulative impact if the project's incremental effect combined with the effects of other projects is "cumulatively considerable." CEQA Guidelines section 15130(a). The CEQA Guidelines define cumulative impacts as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." CEQA Guidelines section 15355. Cumulative impacts may result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time. CEQA Guidelines section 15355(b). This determination is based on an assessment of the project's incremental effects "viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects." CEQA Guidelines section 15065(a)(3). The CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR implement the provisions of Pub Res Code section 21083(b)(2), which specifies that the Guidelines must include criteria requiring public agencies to find that a project may have a significant effect on the environment if its possible effects "are individually limited but cumulatively considerable."
- Further, a cumulative impact is an impact created by the combination of the project reviewed in the EIR together with other projects causing *related impacts*. 14 Cal Code Regs §15130(a)(1). (Emphasis added). The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental effect of the project when added to other past, present, and probable future projects. 14 Cal Code Regs §§15065(a)(3), 15130(b)(1)(A), 15355(b).

An EIR need not discuss cumulative impacts that do not result in part from the project. 14 Cal Code Regs §15130(a)(1). If a project does not make some contribution to a cumulative environmental effect, the cumulative effect cannot be characterized as a cumulative impact of that project.

- Here, the Project EIR considered projects within a geographic radius of the project (e.g., the Tropico area) for purposes of determining whether the Project would create any cumulative impacts in combination with any other past present, or future projects. The geographic area surrounding the Project is relevant because this Project's significant cultural resource impact is based on the proposed demolition of a 1919 City of Tropico era Craftsman home, accordingly it is appropriate to assess the impact of the proposed demolition in combination with related projects, e.g., those that also demolish Craftsman homes from this geographic era or period of significance.
- In response to community concerns about the loss of Craftsman-style residences over the years, the City produced the Craftsman Survey in 2007,

which identified potentially historic properties in high- and moderate-density multi-family zones (the subject Property was not included because the SFMU zone was not surveyed). In 2017-2019, the South Glendale Historic Resource Survey was completed, which identified potentially historic properties (of all styles and types, including the subject Property) in the portion of the city south of the 134 Freeway. Based on staff review of the City's permit database, no Craftsman buildings identified as potentially eligible for listing in the Glendale Register of Historic Resources in either survey, and therefore considered as historic resources under CEQA, have been demolished. The only known demolition of a Craftsman-style building in the last fifteen years occurred in northwest Glendale in 2018, when an owner illegally demolished a previously unidentified Craftsman, which unauthorized demolition led the City to adopt strong demolition deterrence policies. In conclusion, no Craftsman building identified in surveys or by City staff or community members has been demolished in at least fifteen years, marking the Project as a singular demolition request that cannot be viewed as having a cumulatively considerable impact on cultural resources that involved or which will involve the demolition of a historic Craftsman style residence.

- **HPC opined Alternative #3 (Reduced Density and retain 1642 South Central Avenue in its existing location on the project site) was preferred; HPC Commissioner Jurca opined that Public Resourced Code (PRC) section 21001 mandates selection of the less environmentally impactful alternative.**
 - The HPC member's reference to PRC section 21001 was incomplete. PRC section 21001 states, in whole that: "The Legislature finds and declares that it is the policy of the state that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects of such projects, and that the procedures required by this division are intended to assist public agencies in systematically identifying both the significant effects of proposed projects and the feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures which will avoid or substantially lessen such significant effects. *The Legislature further finds and declares that in the event specific economic, social, or other conditions make infeasible such project alternatives or such mitigation measures, individual projects may be approved in spite of one or more significant effects thereof.*" (Emphasis added).
 - Based on the complete reading of the statute, the legislative body is not "mandated" to select project alternatives that substantially lessen significant environmental effects where there are specific environmental, social, or other conditions that make such election infeasible.
 - Here, the applicant has indicated they have specific evidence supporting why development of Alternative #3 would be economically infeasible, even though Alternative #3 would preserve the historic resource.

- Additionally, the Project applicant points out that as a Density Bonus, transit oriented, housing project located directly across the street from the Larry Zarian Transportation Center - Glendale's main transit hub, the Project fits exactly into the City's General Plan Housing Element goals to provide more housing and affordable housing near transit. The proposed Project would yield 31 residential dwelling units including very low income units. Furthermore, the applicant explains that the HPC did not consider the goals and policies of the Housing Element 2021-2029 (Exhibit 11).
- It is appropriate for the decision-making body to consider specific economic, social, or other conditions. The Project has been identified to assist with citywide Housing Element Goals 1 and 3 – which include:

Goal 1: A city with a wide range of housing types to meet the needs of current and future residents.

- Policy 1.2: Maintain adequate capacity to accommodate the City's unmet Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for all income categories throughout the planning period.
- Policy 1.3: Promote the dispersion of affordable housing throughout the City while recognizing the potential for the integration of market rate and affordable units within individual projects.
- Policy 1.4: Encourage higher-density residential development in proximity to public transportation, jobs, services, and activity centers.

Goal 3: A city with increased opportunities for affordable and special needs housing development.

- Policy 3.2: Promote the development of extremely low, very low, low and moderate income housing by allowing developers density bonuses or other financial incentives for providing units for low and moderate income residents. The unit mix and location of affordable housing units in density bonus projects must be approved by the City and included in an affordable housing agreement.

The Project will assist the City in meeting General Plan Housing Element Policies 1.2, 1.3, and 3.2 and the state mandated Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) because, if approved, the Project would add 31 units to the housing stock with a mix of market rate and very low income households. The base underlying density for this 9,958 square-foot SFMU zoned lot is 22.86 units (23 units) maximum. The applicant is requesting a 35% density bonus (8 additional dwelling units) above the maximum density to reach 31 dwelling units total. Further, Policy 1.4 encourages higher density residential development in proximity of public transportation, jobs, services and activity centers. The Project meets all these policy goals because it is located across the street

from a multi/modal mass transit center, Larry Zarian Transportation Center, that is serviced by Metro buses, Glendale Beeline, Metrolink, Amtrak and Greyhound.

Applicability of No Net Loss Law

Furthermore, the Housing Element identified the Project site for 31 units with three units reserved for very low income households. California Government Code Section 65863, (Statutes of 2018 (Senate Bill 1333)), (No Net Loss Law), effective January 1, 2019, specifies that if the City were to approve this project at a lower density, such as by Alternatives 2 or Alternative 3, then the City must either make findings that the Housing Element's remaining sites have sufficient capacity to accommodate the remaining unmet RHNA by each income level, or identify and make available sufficient sites to accommodate the remaining unmet RHNA for each income category.

Specifically, the No Net Loss Law effective, applies to all jurisdictions, including charter cities and applies to the current and subsequent Housing Element planning periods. Responsibilities and Requirements under No Net Loss Law can be divided into three statutory areas of responsibility for jurisdictions to consider when making land-use decisions related to sites and capacity identified in the Housing Element to accommodate the RHNA:

- Maintaining Sites (Government Code section 65863(a))
- Jurisdiction Actions Relating to Zoning (Government Code section 65863(b)(1))
- Approval of Development at a Lower Density (Government Code section 65863(b)(2))

Maintaining Sites

A jurisdiction must ensure their Housing Element sites inventory continues to have capacity at all times to accommodate the RHNA by income group throughout the planning period. Action by the jurisdiction to modify development standards in a way that would result in a lower density, limit or stop development on sites identified in the inventory, exchange sites in the inventory, or downzone sites would trigger No Net Loss unless the jurisdiction can make the required findings or identify alternative sites.

If, at any time during the planning period, the jurisdiction finds that there is a shortfall of sites to accommodate its remaining RHNA, the jurisdiction must take immediate action to correct the shortfall by amending its Housing Element sites inventory to either include sites previously unidentified with capacity to accommodate the shortfall, or sites that have been rezoned to correct for the shortfall. Failure to do so constitutes a violation of the No Net Loss law.

The lack of sites to accommodate the jurisdiction's RHNA represents a fundamental alteration to the jurisdiction's ability to meet Housing Element Law. Therefore, the amended inventory must (1) demonstrate sites to address the shortfall meet the adequate site requirements of Housing Element Law, pursuant to Government Code section 65585(b), and (2) be submitted to the California Department of Housing and Community Development (Department) for review to ensure compliance with state Housing Element Law. (Cal. Gov't Code §65580 et seq.) (Housing Element Law).

Jurisdiction Actions

Jurisdiction actions include downzoning or other actions taken by a jurisdiction to reduce a parcel's allowable residential density. This can be done through a change in zoning or an imposition of density limitations that preclude that ability to achieve densities assumed in the Housing Element sites inventory. If the parcel to be downzoned is identified in the Housing Element, a jurisdiction must make written findings, supported by substantial evidence, that:

- The reduction is consistent with the jurisdiction's adopted general plan, including the Housing Element. For example, this finding could be made if downzone does not change the land use and zoning designation.
- The remaining sites identified in the Housing Element are adequate to meet the requirements of Section 65583.2 and to accommodate the jurisdiction's remaining share of the RHNA for the planning period. The finding must include a quantification of the remaining unmet need for the jurisdiction's RHNA at each income level and the remaining capacity of sites identified in the Housing Element to accommodate that need by income level.

If a jurisdiction cannot make these findings, it may take action to reduce the residential density of a parcel only if it identifies or rezones additional sufficient adequate sites with an equal or greater residential density in the jurisdiction so that there is sufficient residential unit capacity appropriate to accommodate the RHNA by income level. Actions to identify additional sites or rezone must occur before or concurrently with any action or approval to reduce a parcel's density. Sites identified or rezoned must meet the following criteria:

- Must be considered an adequate site pursuant to the requirements of Government Code section 65583.2.

- If the capacity to be replaced was on a site that was zoned by-right pursuant to Government Code section 65863.2 (h) and (i), then the replacement site must also satisfy those requirements.

These actions would represent a fundamental alteration to the Housing Element; therefore, the Housing Element sites inventory must then be amended and, pursuant to Government Code section 65585(b), be submitted to the HCD for review to ensure the compliance with state Housing Element Law, prior to, or concurrently with, any action or approval to reduce a parcel's density.

Approval of Development at a Lower Density

A jurisdiction must make written findings or identify additional site capacity if a development is allowed with a lower density than what was assumed in the sites inventory of the Housing Element. A lower residential density sometimes results from a jurisdiction either approving a development with residential units less than what was assumed for the site or affordable to a different income category than the site was assumed to accommodate.

At the time of approval, the following written findings must be made, and supported by substantial evidence in the record:

- Remaining sites identified in the Housing Element are adequate to meet the jurisdiction's remaining RHNA for the planning period by income category.
- The findings should include a quantification of the remaining unmet need for the jurisdiction's RHNA at each income level and the remaining capacity of sites identified in the Housing Element, to accommodate that need by income level.

If the approval of a development at a lower residential density results in the remaining sites capacity becoming inadequate to accommodate the RHNA by income category, a jurisdiction has up to 180 days from the approval to identify, or rezone, "sufficient additional, adequate, and available sites" to accommodate the remaining RHNA for each income category. Sites identified or rezoned must meet the following criteria:

- Must be considered an adequate site pursuant to the requirements of Government Code section 65583.2.
- If the capacity to be replaced was on a site that was zoned by-right pursuant to Government Code section 65863.2 (h) and (i), then the replacement site must also satisfy those requirements.

A jurisdiction must report in the jurisdiction's Annual Progress Report (APR) any sites that have been identified or rezoned to accommodate the resulting shortfall due to the approval of a development at a lower density. APRs are required to be sent to the Department by all jurisdictions by April 1, pursuant to Government Code section 65400. For more information on completing this section of the APR.

Failure to Comply with No Net Loss Law

In addition to violating of the No Net Loss Law, the failure to ensure that there are sufficient adequate sites to accommodate the unmet RHNA by income category throughout the entire planning period is also a violation of the Housing Element Law. This is because the Housing Element will also fail to identify adequate sites to accommodate the RHNA by income category. As a result, pursuant to Government Code section 65585 (i) and (j), the Department may revoke a jurisdiction's Housing Element compliance and/or refer the violation to the Attorney General. In addition, a third party may file an action to challenge the jurisdiction in court.

Applicability to this Project

The proposed project at 1642 S. Central Avenue was included in the Housing Element Update at a density of 31 units, including 3 lower income units, and 28 above moderate units. Should the Council not approve the project or approve the project at a lower density, the remaining sites identified in the Housing Element are adequate to meet the jurisdiction's remaining RHNA for the planning period by income category because the Glendale's certified Housing Element has a surplus of 203 Lower income units and 763 above moderate income units. The Council would have to include this finding in a decision to deny the project or approve it at a reduced density.

Appeal Process and Analysis of the Applicant/Appellant's Appeal

Pursuant to GMC Section 30.62.010, "All appeals shall be de novo, in that an independent reexamination of the matter shall be made." The applicant requests the City Council to reexamine the Project taking into consideration the City's housing goals and policies, as well as other socio-economic and environmental considerations.

The appellant contends that the Historic Preservation Commission failed to recognize the importance of creating much needed market rate and affordable housing units within proximity of Larry Zarian Transportation Center.

Staff's Response:

The appellant believes the HPC focused entirely on the demolition of 1642 South Central Avenue and failed to analyze or consider whether the Project benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects. If the City Council, as lead agency, decides to certify

the FEIR and approve the Project as proposed (or conditioned), CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 requires the decisionmaker to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations with factual findings demonstrating that the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a project outweigh its the significant unavoidable environmental impacts on construction noise/vibration and cultural resources. Findings supporting the required Statement of Overriding Considerations are set forth in the Resolution certifying the FEIR that are presented in conjunction with this Staff Report. If the Council, as Lead Agency, finds the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, which here are limited to 1) the temporary construction period (noise and vibration), and 2) loss of one Craftsman house, then the adverse environmental effects may be considered “acceptable”.

The appellant contends that the project complies with all development standards for the SFMU zone and is compliant with the State of California requirements for a Density Bonus Housing project.

Staff’s Response:

The Project will occupy the majority of site and will generally follow the rectangular shape of the lot. The building footprint complies with the street front, street side and interior setbacks required by the SFMU zone and will be configured with zero setbacks from the northern (South Central Avenue), western (Gardena Avenue) and eastern property lines, and will be located approximately 5 feet from the southern interior property line. The building is designed with a 62’-6” (height) and five-story configuration, and is consistent with development standards for SFMU zoned properties – which allows 75 feet (height)/6 stories when not abutting a single or multi-family residential zones. The Project is located across the street from a major transit stop (Larry Zarian Transportation Center) across Gardena Avenue, and therefore GMC Section 30.36.090 (C) (1) allows for a half (0.5) parking space requirement per unit.

Appellant further contends the Project’s modern design is appropriate for the site and neighborhood context.

Staff’s Response:

The proposed building has been designed in modern/contemporary style and is clad with a variety of quality finishes, such as smooth cement plaster, corrugated metal siding, metal panel siding (at corresponding balconies), and windows and doors constructed of anodized aluminum material. The overall mass and scale of the proposed five-story building is consistent with existing mixed-use zoning, including the adjacent industrial uses to the north and west, residential single-family uses to the south, and the Larry Zarian Transportation Center to the west. The ground level at the Gardena Avenue façade is set back seven feet from the street and improved with layered landscaping to introducing a human scale design which enhances the pedestrian experience from the street. The massing at the northeastern façade facing South Central Avenue is broken into separate volumes which includes recessed

volumes to accommodate the stair/elevator tower, as well as the outdoor garden terrace at the second floor level that is open to the sky. The upper floor levels include a series of recessed balconies that reduce the appearance of long continuous segments of building walls along Gardena Avenue. Additional articulation at the street facing facades is recommended to break-up the mass and provide a better overall appearance.

The appellant contends that the HPC tried to impose language and mitigation measures as part of the FEIR's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) that are unachievable and beyond standard practice for noise/vibration mitigation.

Staff's Response:

The CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(a)(1)(B) acknowledge there are exceptions to the rule that mitigation should not be “deferred” in that mitigation measures may specify performance standards for mitigating a significant impact when it is impractical or infeasible to specify the specific details of mitigation during the EIR review process, (e.g., when certain site conditions are unknown, when the exact type of equipment available to perform a task is unknown), provided the lead agency commits to implement the mitigation, adopts the specified performance standard, and identifies the types of actions that may achieve compliance with the performance standard. The proposed mitigation measures meet these standards and are not inappropriately “deferred”.

During the HPC's initial review (January 19, 2023), the HPC expressed concerns with the timing and certainty of implementing the FEIR's mitigation measures for construction noise and vibration. HPC Commissioner Jurca objected to several measures because they included the term “where feasible”, “whenever feasible” and “to the extent feasible”. By definition, mitigation measures have a statutory “feasibility” requirement. Staff provided an Errata (Attachment 8) to identify minor clarifications and changes to the MMRP to remove the terms “where feasible”, “whenever feasible” and “to the extent feasible” and identify specific timing of mitigation. The table below reflects the edits to the mitigation measures in the MMRP to address Commissioner Jurca's comment. These edits clarify and amplify the purpose of the proposed mitigation.

Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Schedule and Verification of Compliance
Section 3.2, Noise and Vibration				
Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Glendale (City) Department of Building and Safety, or designee, shall verify that all construction plans include notes stipulating the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grading and construction contractors shall use equipment that generates lower vibration levels, such as rubber-tired equipment rather than metal-tracked equipment. Construction haul truck and materials delivery traffic shall avoid <u>Local Streets and Urban and Community and Neighborhood Collectors as defined in the city's Circulation Element residential areas whenever feasible.</u> The construction contractor shall place noise- and vibration-generating construction equipment <u>with exception of equipment needed to complete shoring activities associated with the construction of the subterranean garage, away from sensitive uses. All and located</u> construction staging areas <u>shall be located</u> away from sensitive uses. <u>whenever feasible.</u> The construction contractor shall <u>only</u> use on-site electrical sources to power equipment rather than diesel generators <u>where feasible.</u> The construction contractor shall ensure that a minimum 12-foot-high barrier, such as plywood structures or flexible sound control curtains, shall be erected between on the proposed project site and adjacent to the sensitive receptors to minimize the amount of noise during construction. A 12-foot-high construction noise barrier would provide approximately 12 dBA reduction to the closest residential receptors to the south. <p>All residential units located within 500 feet of the construction site shall be sent a notice regarding the construction schedule. A sign legible at a <u>distance of 50 feet</u> shall also be posted at the construction site. All notices and the signs shall indicate the dates and durations of construction activities, as well as provide a telephone number for the noise disturbance coordinator.</p>	Project Applicant and their construction contractor	Prior to issuance of demolition permits for construction	City of Glendale	Date: _____ Initials: _____

Mitigation Measures Adopted as Conditions of Approval	Responsibility for Implementation	Mitigation Schedule	Monitoring/Reporting Responsibility	Schedule and Verification of Compliance
Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Construction Vibration Control Prior to issuance of demolition permits, the Glendale (City) Department of Building and Safety, or designee, shall verify that all construction plans include notes stipulating the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining Buffer Distances. Maintain a safe distance between the operation of vibration-generating construction equipment and the potentially affected building and/or structure to avoid damage to the extent possible as presented in Table 1, based on site constraints; and Alternative Construction Equipment. To the extent feasible, the construction contractor shall use alternative construction techniques or equipment, such as hand excavation to avoid or reduce unnecessary construction vibration. Prepare a Monitoring Plan. The property owner shall undertake a monitoring program to avoid or reduce project-related construction vibration damage to adjacent buildings and/or structures and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. The monitoring program shall apply to all potentially affected buildings and/or structures adjacent to the project site. Prior to issuance of any demolition or building permit, the property owner shall submit the construction vibration monitoring plan to the City for approval. The monitoring plan shall include, at a minimum, the following components, as applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Vibration Analysis Refinement. Once the specific construction equipment list becomes available, potential vibration damage distance contours shall be refined.</u> Vibration Monitoring. To ensure that construction vibration levels do not exceed the established standard, an acoustical consultant shall monitor vibration levels at each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties when heavy construction occurs in <u>close proximity.</u> Based on direction from the acoustical consultant, vibratory construction activities that generate vibration levels <u>in excess of</u> the standard shall be prohibited. Alternative Construction Techniques. Should construction vibration levels be observed <u>in excess of</u> the established standard, the contractor(s) shall halt construction and put alternative construction techniques into practice, <u>to the extent feasible.</u> Following incorporation of the alternative construction techniques, vibration monitoring shall recommence to ensure that vibration levels at each affected building and/or structure on adjacent properties are not exceeded. 	Project Applicant and their construction contractor	Prior to issuance of demolition permits for construction	City of Glendale	Date: _____ Initials: _____

STAKEHOLDERS/OUTREACH

As required by the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal Code Regs §15082(a)(1)), the City issued a Notice of Preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Proposed Project on June 10, 2021. The Project DEIR was circulated for public review and comment from March 24, 2022, through April 22, 2022, for a 30-day period to reach out to the following stakeholders:

Outreach was undertaken to the following stakeholders:

- Residents
- Parties and/or individuals that expressed interest

The Planning Division utilized the following outreach methods:

- Circulate the Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (PR-DEIR) for public review and comment for a 30-day period.
- Conduct public hearings with the Historic Preservation Commission regarding the Project on January 19, 2023, and February 16, 2023.
- Issue public notices via mailer and email.
- Publish public notices with Los Angeles County Clerk, State of California – Office of Planning & Research and on the Planning Division website.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated with certifying the FEIR, adopting the MMRP and Statement of Overriding Considerations and approving the Design Review request.

CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE

In accordance with the City Campaign Finance Ordinance No. 5744, Exhibit 9 is attached and contains the names and business addresses of the members of the board of directors, the chairperson, CEO, COO, CFO, Subcontractors and any person or entity with more than 10% interest or more in the company proposed for contract in this Agenda Item.

ALTERNATIVES

The City Council has the following options in considering the Project:

- 1: Reverse the Historic Preservation Commission's decision to deny the Project and adopt the resolution certifying the FEIR for the proposed Project (31 units), adopt findings supporting a Statement of Overriding Considerations in light of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts from (i) the demolition of the existing historic house at 1642 S. Central Avenue, and (ii) temporary construction-generated noise and vibration impacts

and making findings in support thereof; adopt the MMRP; and approve the Design Review application as proposed.

2: Reverse the Historic Preservation Commission's decision to deny the Project and adopt the resolution certifying the FEIR for the proposed Project (31) units, adopt findings supporting a Statement of Overriding Considerations in light of the Project's significant and unavoidable impacts from (i) the demolition of the existing historic house at 1642 S. Central Avenue, and (ii) temporary construction-generated noise and vibration impacts and making findings in support thereof; adopt the MMRP; and approve the Design Review application as proposed with amended conditions.

3: Sustain the Historic Preservation Commission's decision to deny the FEIR and to deny the Design Review application with direction to resubmit a new application for HPC's review with Project Design Alternative 2 (reduced density and relocation of 1642 S. Central Avenue on the Project site) with conditions and provide the statutorily required No Net Loss Findings.

4: Sustain the Historic Preservation Commission's decision to deny the FEIR and to deny the Design Review application with direction to resubmit a new application for HPC's review with Project Design Alternative 3 (reduced density alternative) which retains 1642 South Central Avenue at its existing location with conditions and provide the statutorily required No Net Loss Findings.

5: The City Council may also consider any other alternatives to design review submission not proposed by staff.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION

Prepared by:

Dennis Joe, Senior Planner

Reviewed by:

Jay Platt, Principal Urban Designer

Erik Krause, Deputy Director of Community Development

Jason Bradford, Director of Finance

Michael J. Garcia, City Attorney

Gillian van Muyden, Chief Assistant City Attorney

Approved by:

Roubik R. Golanian, P.E., City Manager

EXHIBITS / ATTACHMENTS

1. Final Environmental Impact Report
2. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
3. Partially Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report
4. Draft Environmental Impact Report

Note: Attachments 1-4 and supporting documents can be reviewed online at:
www.glendaleca.gov/environmental

5. Reduced Plans
6. Photos of Existing Property
7. Location Map
8. Errata to Final Environmental Impact Report
9. Conflict of Interest Statement and Campaign Disclosure Form
10. Housing Element 2021-2029 can be viewed online at:
<https://www.glendaleplan.com/housing-element-update>
11. Appeal Form (completed by the appellant)
12. HPC Draft Statement of Overriding Considerations