



Scenic Pacifica

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

Prepared For:

**Proposed Single-Family Dwelling at
100 Juanita Avenue
Pacifica, CA
(APN 018-160-070)**

Date Prepared:

February 23, 2007

Prepared By:

**CITY OF PACIFICA
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1800 FRANCISCO BOULEVARD
PACIFICA, CA 94044
(650) 738-7341**

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



CITY OF PACIFICA
 PLANNING & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
INITIAL STUDY AND CHECKLIST

Date: February 23, 2007

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Requirements

This report has been prepared in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and applicable guidelines.

Project Title: Proposed Single-Family Dwelling at 100 Juanita Avenue, Pacifica, California

Lead Agency: City of Pacifica Contact Person: Kathryn Farbstein, Assistant Planner
 170 Santa Maria Ave. (650) 738-7341
 Pacifica, CA 94044

Project Sponsor/Owner: Kevin Russell
 837 Prairie Creek Drive
 Pacifica, CA 94044

Project Location: 100 Juanita Avenue, Pacifica, CA 94044

General Plan Designation/Zoning Classification: The General Plan designation for the entire 28 acres of the project site is Very Low Density Residential and the site is zoned A/B-5/HPD, which is classified as Agricultural with Lot Size and Hillside Preservation District Overlays. Attachment a identifies the General Plan designations and zoning of the subject site and surrounding properties. The proposed project is compatible with both designations.

Project Description: The project applicant and property owner proposes to construct a single-family residence of approximately 5,000 square feet and an attached garage of 600 square feet, with 750 square feet unfinished enclosed space adjacent to the garage (see Attachment b) on a 28 acre parcel. The proposed site plan is shown in Attachment c. The dwelling is proposed as three levels with a sloped roof. In addition to the four bedrooms and five bathrooms, the applicant is also proposing an open kitchen/family/dining area, living room, office, entry, and a recreation room. The living area for the second level would be approximately 3,500 square feet, and the third and topmost floor would be approximately 1,500 square feet. The total height of the proposed building would be 35 feet.

The materials proposed would be asphalt shingles for the roof, wood siding, wood trim around doors and windows, with fieldstone walls and on the chimney. A sample of the colors to be utilized on the project was also submitted by the applicant and is included with the plans.

Vehicular access to the site is from both Juanita and Bonita Avenues. The need for two access roads is due to the Fire Code requirements for emergency vehicle access that state a newly created driveway cannot be more than approximately 500 feet from an intersection. If the Bonita Avenue extension was not completed for this project, the distance from proposed single-family dwelling to the nearest intersection at Reina Del Mar would be more than 900 feet.

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|--|---|---------------------|

The watershed within which this property lies is a tributary to Calera Creek at the southwesterly corner of the property in the area of Winona and Verona Avenues. The watershed contains about 55 acres, and flows to and along the southerly boundary of the property from Juanita Avenue to Calera Creek. The existing drainage system consists primarily of earth ditching along the adjoining properties to the south. The drainage improvements proposed include swales along the driveways, culverts crossing the driveways and other drainage improvements to collect runoff from the house and surrounding area. This increased runoff due to the proposed development will not be observable relative to the flow which occurs under present conditions.

More than 100 Heritage Trees, planted many years ago, are currently situated on the project site. Heritage Trees are trees within the City of Pacifica, other than eucalyptus, that are 50 inches or more in circumference when measured at 24 inches above grade. The trees, which have been evaluated by a certified arborist, vary in size and health, but all the trees are Monterey Cypress. Seven of these trees are recommended for removal by the arborist in order to accommodate the proposed development. Four of the trees that range in size from 19" to 42" in diameter are in poor health and removal of these trees and stumps is recommended and planned. The three remaining trees, which range in size from 32" to 50" in diameter are in moderately good to fair condition; however, due to the location of these trees at the end of Juanita and Bonita Avenue, the trees have to be removed to allow access to the site. One of the trees to be removed is located in a line of trees, and the removal of this tree will not impact the adjacent trees. The arborist's evaluation also recommends root protection utilizing plastic fencing firmly attached to 6 foot tall steel posts driven into the ground a minimum of 12", which should be installed following removal of the trees and any safety pruning in the swale. The applicant will replace the trees removed per the recommendations in the arborist's report.

The proposed project is in conformance with all City requirements and the required local permits and/or approvals including a Use Permit, Site Development Permit and Encroachment Permit.

Site Description: The approximately 28-acre project site is located in the central portion of the City of Pacifica in the Vallemar Neighborhood (see Attachment c). The site is located north of Reina Del Mar and east of Highway 1. The irregularly shaped site is located on the uphill slope, extending west to east from Reichling Avenue to Nataqua Avenue, approximately 2,300 feet. At its widest point spanning from south to north, the property extends approximately 800 feet. The property is located on a southerly flank of a dissected, east-west trending ridgeline bordering the northern site of Calera Creek. This site is undeveloped and the terrain is characterized by steep, grass and brush covered hillsides, abutting moderately steep to gentle slopes along the southern margin.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The land to the north and east of the site is part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) except for a small portion owned by the North Coast County Water District that contains a water tank, north of the subject site. The property to the west is owned by the Pacifica School District. Land to the south of the subject site is owned by many individual owners, each parcel containing a single-family dwelling.

Other public agency approval(s) required: None.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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 mitigation measures, as described on an attached sheet (Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan) and agreed to by the applicant, have been added to the project. **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 on the effects that remain to be addressed.
- 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 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.

City of Pacifica: _____ Date: _____
(Signature)

Kathryn Farbstein, Assistant Planner, City of Pacifica, Planning and Economic Development Department

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

LEVEL OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This checklist indicates the potential level of impact for each environmental factor, including subcategory, as follows:

Potentially Significant Impact: Applies if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If one or more of these entries are made, an EIR is required.

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact". Describe mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect accordingly. Reference source documentation in parenthesis ().

Less Than Significant Impact: Requires brief explanation. Reference source documentation in parenthesis ().

No Impact: No explanation required when source documentation is referenced () and adequately supports that impact does not apply. Explanation is, however, required when finding is based on project-specific factors or general standards.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? (1) | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) 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? (1) | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural Community conservation plan? (1) | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The proposed project meets the City's existing General Plan, Program and Zoning Code regulations and does not include any elements that would physically divide any established community. The proposed project would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or community conservation plan.

Mitigation: None required

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (1) | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (1) | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the | | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (1) ___ ___ ___ X

Discussion of Evaluation: The proposal to construct one single-family dwelling will induce minimal population growth by providing one new housing unit. However, since no new roads or other infrastructure are proposed other than the private access roadways on the subject site, the growth would be confined to the one dwelling proposed for construction. Infrastructure is available to accommodate the proposed project. The project would not displace any housing units or people, and it would not necessitate the construction of any replacement housing. Moreover, growth in this particular location has been accounted for in the City's General Plan designation of Very Low Density Residential, which averages one-half to five acres per dwelling unit depending on physical and practical constraints associated with a given project. The project site is roughly 28 acres and could conceivably support as many as 14 new dwelling units although only one has been proposed. Therefore, the amount of growth resulting from this particular project is consistent with the City's plans for the site. No significant negative impacts related to housing are anticipated by the proposed project.

Mitigation: None required.

III. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|----------|----------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| 1) Rupture of 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? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| 2) Strong seismic ground shaking? () | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ |
| 3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| 4) Landslides? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? () | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ |
| c) 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? () | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property? () | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ |
| e) 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 wastewater? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|--|---|---------------------|

Discussion of Evaluation: The site is not within a State of California designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, but is located in the San Francisco Bay Area, considered one of the most seismically active regions in the United States. Significant earthquakes have occurred in the Bay Area, and will continue to occur, with varying intensities, depending upon the magnitude of earthquake, the distance of the site from the causative fault, and the type of materials underlying the site.

No known active faults or fault traces are known to pass through the subject site; therefore, the risk of fault rupture in the development area is low. The nearest active faults to the subject site include the offshore trace of the Seal Cove fault approximately 5 1/3 miles to the southwest, and the San Andreas fault mapped approximately 1 1/2 miles to the northeast (Jennings, 1994). Movement of the earth's crust on the San Andreas fault in the 1906 earthquake, centered in the northern part of the San Francisco peninsula, produced a magnitude 8 earthquake and very strong ground shaking in the Pacifica area (Plafker and Galloway, 1989). The 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake, having a magnitude of 7.1 and centered in the southern Santa Cruz Mountains, approximately 50 miles south of the site, produced strong ground shaking in the Pacifica area. According to Borchardt and others (1974), and Peterson and others (1999), one or more major earthquakes centered nearby could produce very strong to violent ground shaking in the Vallemar area. There have been no reports of earthquake induced landslides or liquefaction affecting the proposed development area (Youd and Hoose, 1984; Plafker and Galloway, 1989).

However, due to the proximity of the nearest active fault line, the San Andreas fault a few miles to the east, the proposed development, along with all of the City of Pacifica, engenders risk of seismic instability. Due to its proximity to the San Andreas Fault and the generally seismically active region, severe ground shaking and seismic-related ground is likely during the life of the structure(s), particularly during a major seismic event.

The project site is adjacent to existing development on the south and west, and the project will not involve extensive grading.

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures have been identified for this project. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

1. Prior to issuance of a building permit, a design-level geotechnical investigation and report shall be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval by the City or City designee. The geotechnical investigation shall ensure that given the site's geotechnical conditions and potential geologic hazards, risks due to subsidence and unstable soils, are minimized to an insignificant level. All measures, design criteria, and specifications in the geotechnical report shall be incorporated into the project design. The design level geotechnical investigation and report shall be peer reviewed during the plan check process. Before the building permit is issued, all recommendations from the City's geotechnical peer review shall be incorporated into the design of the project. All soil handling and conditioning measures and structural foundations shall be designed by a licensed professional engineer, and all on-site soil management and conditioning activities shall be conducted under the supervision of a licensed Geotechnical Engineer or Certified Engineering Geologist.
2. All building and utility improvements shall be designed and constructed in compliance with the California Building Code which was enacted in order to minimize any seismic impacts. Prior to issuance of building permits, building and utility design drawings shall be prepared and submitted to the City for review and confirmation that the proposed development fully complies with the building code.

IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

| | Potential Significant Impact | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? () | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ |
| b) 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)? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? () | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ | ___ |
| d) 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 substantial flooding on- or off-site? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantially additional sources of polluted runoff? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| g) 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? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which could impede or redirect flood flows? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| i) 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? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The project will result in covering and/or compacting vacant land that was previously undeveloped, resulting in increased impermeable surfaces. The development of the property as proposed will add approximately 0.6 acre of impervious surface to the watershed which will have the effect of increasing the flow by approximately 1%. Consequently, the current absorption rates and drainage patterns would change with the proposed project or any development of the site. However, the change is not inconsistent with the surrounding neighborhood and is not expected to generate a significant environmental impact in that only one dwelling with

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|--|---|---------------------|

associated access roads is being proposed on a 28 acre parcel. The project area is not within a 100-year flood zone and storm water run-off during extreme weather events has been accounted for in the project design.

Projects that exceed an acre of disturbed area require that a Notice of Intent (NOI) is filed with the State Water Resources Control Board to obtain coverage under the State General Construction Activity National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The applicants must prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for these construction sites. In this case, the amount of disturbed area proposed for the dwelling, hardscape and roadways is 34,200 square feet or 0.8 acre, which is less than the one acre threshold. However, with construction staging that occurs for the project, it is likely that the one acre threshold will be exceeded. Thus, the NPDES mandated NOI and SWPPP would likely be required for this project.

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) through the NPDES permit regulates stormwater control before, during and after construction of the proposed project. Projects with impervious surface area exceeding 10,000 square feet in size, and not determined complete prior to August 15, 2006, require compliance with Provision C.3 of STOPPP's amended NPDES permit. This project was determined complete on October 27, 2006 and is, therefore, subject to the C.3 requirements.

Although the subject site is located along a hillside, the proposed dwelling will be located on a generally level portion of the site; therefore, extensive grading has not been proposed and no significant impacts are expected.

Mitigation: Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- 1) San Mateo County Storm Water Pollution Best Management Practices (BMPs), described as follows, would be employed to ensure that water quality of surface runoff is maintained and no siltation of downstream waterways would occur.
 - (a) All project grading would take place in the dry season to minimize immediate erosion/siltation effects;
 - (b) Construction materials and waste shall be handled and disposed of properly, so as to prevent their contact with stormwater;
 - (c) Discharge of all potential pollutants, including pavement cutting wastes, paints, concrete, petroleum products, chemicals, washwater or sediments, and non-stormwater discharges to storm drains and watercourses shall be controlled and prevented;
 - (d) Sediment controls such as straw mulch, silt fences, sediment basins or traps and/or other measures shall be employed during construction;
 - (e) Tracking dirt or other materials off-site shall be avoided and off-site paved areas and sidewalks shall be cleaned regularly using dry sweeping methods; and
 - (f) The contractor shall train and provide instruction to all employees and subcontractors regarding construction BMPs.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

- 2) Upon submittal of plans for building permit, applicant shall submit a Drainage Plan to include all existing/natural and proposed drainage improvements at the project site. Drainage Improvement shall be to the satisfaction of the Director of Public Works or City Engineer. The Drainage Plan shall be prepared by a licensed professional engineer and it must demonstrate that implementation of the plan will:
 - (a) ensure that there is no net increase in total peak runoff rates from the project site relative to pre-development conditions;
 - (b) ensure that runoff associated with 100-year storm events will not adversely impact Calera Creek and downstream waterways by providing hydrology calculations signed and stamped by a registered engineer;
 - (c) drainage improvements shall include but not be limited to swales, concrete gutters, pipes, inlets and headwalls.
 - (d) be designed to avoid spillage from the swale alongside the adjacent properties to the Director of Public Works' or City Engineer's satisfaction;
 - (e) ensure the integrity of the proposed lined swale along the southern boundary of the site from approximately Juanita Avenue to Calera Creek, which has the potential to erode due to the steep grade of the road; and
 - (f) include a drainage system maintenance program.

- 3) If the disturbed area exceeds one acre, the applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) to comply with the General Construction Activity permit. This permit requires that the project proponent prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) designed to reduce potential impacts to surface water quality through the construction-period of the project. It is not required that the SWPPP be submitted to the RWQCB, but must be maintained on-site and made available to RWQCB staff upon request. The SWPPP shall include specific and detailed Best Management Practices (BMPs) designed to mitigate construction-related pollutants to a level of insignificance. At minimum, BMPs shall include practices to minimize the contact of construction materials, equipment, and maintenance supplies (e.g., fuels, lubricants, paints, solvents, adhesives) with stormwater. The SWPPP shall specify properly designed centralized storage areas that keep these materials out of the rain.

- 4) An important component of the storm water quality protection effort is knowledge of the site supervisors and workers. To educate on-site personnel and maintain awareness of the importance of stormwater quality protection, site supervisors shall conduct regular tailgate meetings to discuss pollution prevention. The frequency of the meetings and required personnel attendance list shall be specified in the SWPPP. The SWPPP shall specify a monitoring program to be implemented by the construction site supervisor, and must include both dry and wet weather inspections. In addition, in accordance with State Water Resources Control Board Resolution No. 2001-046, monitoring shall be required during the construction period for pollutants that may be present in the runoff that are "not visually detectable in runoff". The developer shall retain an independent monitor to conduct weekly inspections and provide written monthly reports to the City of Pacifica to ensure compliance with the SWPPP. RWQCB personnel, who may make unannounced site inspections, are empowered to levy considerable fines if determined that the SWPPP has not been properly prepared and implemented.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

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

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------|----------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? () | — | — | <u>X</u> | — |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal and state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? () | — | — | <u>X</u> | — |
| d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: Pacifica is located along the western edge of the San Francisco Bay Area air basin, and is affected by persistent and frequently strong winds from the Pacific Ocean. The City is also within the Bay Area Air Quality Management District. Other than occasional violations of standards for ozone and suspended particulate matter (PM10), within San Mateo County, the area's air quality standards are generally met. The project site is located within an existing urbanized area characterized by existing development of various types. Development of one single-family residential unit on the subject site of 28 acres would not create objectionable odors.

While the project's small size precludes significant pollutant emissions, construction of the project would likely result in a localized increase of dust or particulate matter generated from site grading and other soil disturbance during construction, which may temporarily expose receptors to air pollutants. According to BAAQMD, temporary, construction-related air quality impacts for all pollutants are considered less-than-significant if standard BAAQMD particulate matter control measures are implemented. Therefore, the following mitigation measures will be implemented in accordance with the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines to further reduce particulate emissions.

Mitigation: Implementation of the following mitigation measures pursuant to Bay Area Air Quality Management District guidelines would reduce the project's construction-related air quality impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- 1) Water all active construction areas at least twice daily and more often during windy *periods*; active areas adjacent to existing land uses shall be kept damp at all times, or shall be treated with non-toxic stabilizers or dust palliatives;
- 2) Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard;
- 3) Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction site;

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|--|---|---------------------|

- 4) Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites; water sweepers shall vacuum up excess water to avoid runoff-related impacts to water quality;
- 5) Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets;
- 6) Apply non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas;
- 7) Enclose, cover, water twice daily, or apply non-toxic soil binders to expose stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.);
- 8) Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph;
- 9) Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways;
- 10) Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible;
- 11) Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site; and
- 12) Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--------------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantially in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (13) | — | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (13) | — | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| c) 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? () | — | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? () | — | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? () | — | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? () | — | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? () | — | — | — | — <u>X</u> — |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|--|---|---------------------|

Discussion of Evaluation: It is not expected that the proposed project will exceed the demand for parking on the subject site or increase traffic on Highway 1 more than any other single-family dwelling. The project includes a two-car garage and two open spaces as required by the HPD overlay; and therefore, the proposed parking satisfies off-street parking requirements for the City of Pacifica. The proposed dwelling would serve as a private residence; thus, the increase in traffic would be minimal and generally consistent with single-family residential development. Additionally, the applicant would be required to extend Juanita and Bonita Avenues onto the subject site to provide access to the proposed dwelling, including emergency vehicular access. As determined in the traffic study, existing roadway capacities are capable of supporting the minimal increase in traffic generated by the project and, as such, no significant impacts are anticipated. Likewise, with respect to cumulative traffic impacts, based on analysis of cumulative traffic conditions at the impacted intersections, the project will not have any impact that is cumulatively considerable such that the incremental effects of the project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current and probable future projects in the area. The construction of a new single family home will have no effect on air traffic patterns, or substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The project will have no effect on alternative transportation modes.

Mitigation: None required.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|----------|----------|
| a) 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 & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?() | — | <u>X</u> | — | — |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| c) 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? () | — | — | <u>X</u> | — |
| d) 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? (6, 7,8) | — | <u>X</u> | — | — |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (5) | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

f) 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

Discussion of Evaluation: An initial Biological Assessment was completed for the subject site by May & Associates in March 2006. Two additional studies by Zander Associates were completed in May 2006 to further assess the biological impacts. The studies concluded that although the first biological assessment identified the potential of up to five special status plant species, a second field survey conducted in spring during the appropriate season to identify such species concluded that no special status plant species are present on the site. In addition, a wetland delineation determined that there are no established, functional wetland habitats and no areas identified as a unique resource that would be affected by the project but there are small areas within the project site that would meet Corps wetland criteria. The extent of these areas would total approximately 50 square feet. However, these areas are hydrologically isolated from the ephemeral drainage on site and would therefore not be subject to Corps jurisdiction. Cite June 2006 Zander report, at 5.

As described in the May & Associates Biological Assessment, the site has the potential to support 12 special status species of wildlife. Potential impacts to these species are discussed below. The May & Associates report also identified three sensitive habitats on the site that potentially support special status wildlife: Arroyo Willow Scrub, Eucalyptus Riparian Woodland on Intermittent Creek, and possible seasonal wetlands. These three habitat types are utilized by a number of special status wildlife species such that disturbance of these areas could result in significant impacts.

An arborist report prepared for the project site indicates that more than 100 trees protected by the City's Municipal Code are located on the project site. Of these trees, seven could be adversely affected by the project through pruning, compaction of root material, or removal.

The five special status bird species to be protected are identified as the olive-sided flycatcher, Nuttall's woodpecker, rufous hummingbird, Allen's hummingbird, and red-breasted sapsucker plus several raptor species, which may have potential habitat on the site. These bird species are migratory birds protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and are listed as federal Species of Concern. Therefore, adverse impacts to the species or their habitats would result in significant impacts.

The San Francisco garter snake, Californian red-legged frog, and two special status invertebrate species (the Tomales isopod and Ricksecker's water scavenger beetle) have the potential to occur in and adjacent to Calera Creek. However, since no project activities are proposed within or adjacent to Calera Creek, no impacts to these species related to disturbance of the aquatic and riparian habitat associated with the creek is anticipated. It is possible that Californian red-legged frog could disperse over land from Calera Creek into upland refugia habitat and/or into the ephemeral drainages on-site, which could potential result in significant adverse impacts to this species.

Finally, three mammal species potentially occurring on the site are the western mastiff bat, long-eared myotis and the San Francisco dusky-footed woodrat. All three of these species potentially occur in the Monterey cypress forest groves on site. Since the proposed driveway will require removal of some of the Monterey cypress forest habitat on site, potentially significant impacts to these species can occur if they are present at the time of removal.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

Mitigation: The following mitigation measures have been identified for this project. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

- 1) Best Management Practices shall be incorporated into the project to prevent erosion and siltation from entering the non-impacted wetlands and drainage during construction. See also mitigation measures specified under Section IV. Hydrology and Water Quality of this Initial Study.
- 2) The proposed driveway shall be constructed to completely span the drainage, thus avoiding the placement of any construction materials within the drainage and allowing for the maintenance of future natural water flows within the drainage.
- 3) No project activities shall occur within 300 feet of the Calera Creek. Project activities involving earth movement and grading shall be conducted outside the rainy season (November-April) when red-legged frogs tend to disperse away from aquatic habitats and across upland habitats for breeding.
- 4) To avoid impacts to sensitive birds and bats during the nesting season (January 1 through August 15), the following measures shall be implemented to avoid disturbing nesting activities, damaging nests and/or harming or killing birds and eggs or young:
 - a) Conduct vegetation removal and grading within the areas proposed for grading after August 15 and before January 1 to prevent disturbance of nesting birds, including the five sensitive species with potential to occur on site and raptors such as red-tailed hawks.
 - b) If all construction cannot be completed during the above timeframe (August 15 through January 1), it is recommended that all grading and vegetation removal be completed before January 1st, and initiating other construction activities that might disturb the birds before they begin nesting.
 - c) If vegetation removal and/or grading cannot be avoided during nesting season (January 1 though August 15), a pre-construction nest survey should be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 10 days prior to vegetation removal or grading activities. If a nest is identified, within the area proposed for grading or within 300 feet, protection measures must be determined in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game (for raptors) which may require that the nest be avoided and protected by a 50- to 150- foot buffer (depending on the species) until the young have fledged (left the nest), generally in mid-to late summer.
 - d) Prior to proposed tree removal within the Monterey cypress forest grove for driveway construction, visual surveys must be conducted by a qualified biologist of the trees proposed for removal and within 100 feet to determine the presence or absence of woodrat nests. If woodrat nests are located during this survey, the nest(s) must be avoided and a minimum protection buffer of 50 feet around each nest must be established. If project activities cannot avoid impacting or removing the nest, the nest(s) should be dismantled by hand by a qualified biologist prior to grading or gestation removal activities. The nest dismantling shall occur during the non-breeding season (October-November) and shall be conducted so that the nest material is removed starting on the side where most impacts will occur and ending on the side where the most habitat will be undisturbed, which will allow for any woodrats in the nest to escape into adjacent undisturbed habitat. If young are encountered during the nest dismantling, the dismantling activity should be stopped and the material replaced back on the nest and the nest should be left alone and rechecked in 2-3 weeks to see if the young are out of the nest or capable of being out on their own (as

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

determined by a qualified biologist); once the young can fend for themselves, the nest dismantling can continue.

5) The heritage trees on site shall be preserved and protected where feasible. All of the recommendations in the arborist's report, including recommendations related to the removal and replacement of trees, shall be incorporated into the project.

VIII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) 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? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: There are no known mineral resources at the subject property and no loss of availability of a locally important mineral or mineral resource recovery site would occur as a result of the project.

Mitigation: None required.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) 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? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Sect. 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| e) 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 of airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project | | | | |

| | Potential Significant Impact | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
| result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| h) Expose people or structures to 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? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The site is not on the CORTESE list of hazardous waste sites. The proposed single-family dwelling on a 28 acre parcel is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through construction, routine transport, use, release or disposal of hazardous materials. Minor amounts of hazardous materials might be used during construction, including paints, solvents, pesticides and herbicides. However, use and disposal of such materials in compliance with the State Health and Safety Code, Pacifica Municipal Code, and the Uniform Fire Code would be required.

Additionally, the project contractors are required to follow the San Mateo County Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program Best Management Practices during construction. These regulations would apply to this project just as they would in every similar development.

The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

The site is not within two miles of a public airport or public use airport and will not interfere with any emergency response or evacuation plans. The project is located in an urban area where there is no significant risk of wildland fires.

Mitigation: None required.

X. NOISE. Would the project result in:

| | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Exposure of persons or 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? () | ___ | ___ | __ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a | | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

— — — X

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

— — — X

Discussion of Evaluation: The construction of one single-family unit on a 28 acre parcel would represent a new source of noise in the area. However, the anticipated noise is expected to be minimal and consistent with existing noise levels in the surrounding single-family neighborhood. Construction noise will occur during project construction, as with all new construction projects, resulting in increased exterior noise levels within the project vicinity. To address construction generated noise, several controls will be incorporated into the project. Specifically, construction activities would be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday, and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays pursuant to Section 8-1.06 (111.2) of the Pacifica Municipal Code. It should be noted that any impacts related to noise would be temporary, lasting only through the project construction period; typically 9-12 months for a project of this type. With the mitigation measures identified below, no significant impact related to noise is expected occur.

Mitigation: Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level:

1. All construction equipment shall be equipped with improved noise muffling and have the manufacturers' recommended noise abatement measures, such as mufflers, engine covers and engine isolators in good working order. All equipment shall be turned off if not in use for more than five minutes and an information sign shall be posted at the entrance to the construction site that identifies the permitted construction hours and provides a telephone number to call and receive project information or to report complaints regarding excessive noise levels.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to main acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

a) Fire protection? () — — — X

b) Police protection? () — — — X

c) Schools? () — — — X

d) Parks? () — — — X

e) Other public facilities? () — — — X

Discussion of Evaluation: The construction of a single-family residential development is expected to cause an increase in demand for public services. The increase, however, is insignificant and is within the limits of existing service capacities. All departments and agencies responsible for supplying public services for this project have

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

indicated their ability to meet the needs of the project. The developer will be assessed any necessary fees to cover these services in connection with the City's issuance of building permits for the project. Thus, no significant impact on Public Services would occur.

Mitigation: None required.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| b) 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? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| c) 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? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| e) 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? | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, and does not exceed the expected growth in the City under the General Plan. Therefore, utilities and service systems needed to serve the project have been planned for and are available to accommodate the proposed single-family development. The appropriate departments and agencies have been notified about the proposal and have indicated that services and utilities are available. The North Coast County Water District (NCCWD or District) has indicated that they may supply a water connection depending upon when the project is constructed. Moreover, NCCWD prepared an Urban Water Management Plan in December 2005, which projects and plans for water demands until 2010. This plan indicates that there is sufficient water to service the project. The plan analyzes the District's available sources of water supply, existing and estimated demand for water, and whether sufficient water supplies exist for planned development in the District's service area under normal and dry year conditions. On page 24 of the plan, the District concludes that sufficient water supplies exist for projected growth and existing uses under normal years, using

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

growth projections from the City's General Plan and the U.S. Census. In conclusion, because the project is consistent with the City's General Plan, the Urban Water Management Plan effectively included this project in its analysis of anticipated growth in water demand and would be able to provide service. Lastly, electric, gas, water, storm, and sewer lines exist within close proximity of the project site and a condition of approval would require all new utility services to be underground. Thus, no significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems would occur.

Mitigation: None required.

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic ocean vista and the site is not identified in the General Plan as having the potential for designation as a scenic roadway. The proposed dwelling will be located approximately 300 feet from the closest road which is located at the end of Bonita Avenue. However, the subject site and hillside is viewed by hikers along the GGNRA land to the north, which looks downward onto the project area, and local residents and visitors to the northern end of the streets in the Vallemar neighborhood from Verona moving eastward to Nataqua Avenues. No public street will run along the project boundary but rather several streets run perpendicular to the site and end at the limits of the property boundaries. The existing view of the 28 acre parcel will only be partially obscured (approximately 3,600 square feet for the dwelling's footprint) by the proposed dwelling, leaving most of the hillside and resultant views intact. Therefore, there is no substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista created as a result of this proposal.

The proposed project is not within the viewing corridor of a state scenic highway. The proposed multi-story single-family dwelling will not substantially damage natural scenic resources such as trees, rocky outcroppings and historic buildings. Although 7 trees will need to be removed for the proposed roadway, the more than 120 remaining trees will be preserved, including the Arroyo Willow Scrub area identified. No rocky outcroppings exist in the area of the site that will be developed with the roadways, dwelling and landscaped areas. The vacant site does not contain any historic structures.

Implementation of the proposed project would involve development of a multi-level single-family dwelling with an attached garage on a currently vacant site. The project site would be graded to accommodate the proposed dwelling. The development including any grading for the site is limited to the footprint of the building because the roadway will follow the contours of the hillside. The entire site is 28 acres but 0.3% of the site would be covered by the building and the total disturbed area including the roadways, dwelling and landscaped area would be 5.3%. Thus, due to the minimal disturbance for development of the proposed dwelling on the subject site, the impact would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

Development of the proposed project would introduce new sources of light and glare, including interior and exterior building lighting and vehicle headlights, reflective surfaces, such as windows and light-colored paint on a hillside that is currently vacant. However, the proposal is limited to a multi-story single-family dwelling, which is similar to the surrounding Vallemar neighborhood of single-family dwellings; thus, the anticipated increase in light and glare impacts for one dwelling is minimal and similar to the nearby dwellings. In addition, the subject site is considered to be a large lot for a single-family development in that neighborhood; thus, the light and glare impacts created for one structure spread out over a 28 acre lot in comparison to light and glare impacts produced by a dwelling placed on a standard 5,000 square foot lot (which is more typical in that neighborhood) would be much less.

Mitigation: None required.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|----------|----------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resources as defined in §15064.5? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? () | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? () | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> | ___ |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal ceremonies? () | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: There are no known cultural or historical resources within the subject site or project vicinity. No archeological remains have been reported with the surrounding development. However, it is always possible that underground resources could be encountered during the project construction period. Impacts to unidentified resources could be significant.

Mitigation: Implementation of the following mitigation measure would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level:

- 1) In the event that a presently undetected cultural resource, including human remains, is revealed, all earthmoving activity within 25 feet of the discovery will cease. The project sponsor will be obligated to retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant who would examine the newly found materials, assess their significance and perform appropriate exploratory and investigative procedures to determine the best course for mitigation of possible adverse impacts associated with the discovery.

XV. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| a) 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? | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a | | | | |

| Potential Significant Impact | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|
|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--------------|

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|----------|
| Williamson Act contract? | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|----------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use? | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
|---|---|---|---|----------|

Discussion of Evaluation: The project site is zoned A/B-5 District with an HPD overlay. The project site is not under Williamson Act Contract. Although the site is zoned for Agricultural use, construction of a single-family dwelling is permitted with approval of a Use Permit and Site Development Permit. No agricultural land uses are located on or in close proximity to the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts to agricultural resources.

Mitigation: None required.

XVI. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
|---|---|---|---|----------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? () | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
|---|---|---|---|----------|

Discussion of Evaluation: The project would neither generate nor create any need for additional recreational opportunities or facilities within the City nor is it suitable for non-motorized modes of transportation such as hiking or biking. Use of local parks or recreational facilities, if any, would be minimal and would not result in any substantial deterioration of any such parks or facilities. Further, the project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, proposed project impacts on recreational facilities would be less than significant.

Mitigation: None required.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
|--|---|---|---|----------|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| b) 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, | — | — | — | — |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)

| | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| --- | --- | --- | <u>X</u> |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|

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

| | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|
| --- | --- | --- | <u>X</u> |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|

Discussion of Evaluation: The proposed project involves the development of a vacant 28 acre lot with one single-family residence. The proposed project is compatible with the existing land uses in the area and will not have any significant impact under this heading, as mitigated under previous sections. There are several additional development projects pending that would contribute to traffic on Highway 1 within the City. However, the incremental effect of this particular project on any potential cumulative traffic is not considerable given the minimal contribution of cars to Highway 1 and the less than 0.010 second delay resulting from it.

This initial study found that the proposed construction of one residential unit at 100 Juanita Avenue, with implementation of the identified mitigation measures, will have no significant impacts on the environment, the habitat of fish or wildlife species or populations, plant or animal communities, rare or endangered plants or animals, or important examples of the major period of California history or prehistory. This specific project is consistent with the surrounding development pattern and would not be cumulatively considerable.

Mitigation: None required.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------|
| Potential Significant <u>Impact</u> | Potential Significant Unless Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u> | Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u> | No <u>Impact</u> |
|---|---|---|---------------------|

LIST OF REFERENCES, CONTACTS AND ATTACHMENTS

List of References

1. City of Pacifica - General Plan, as amended to June 1993.
2. City of Pacifica - Zoning Code, August 1992.
3. Earth Investigation Consultants - Engineering Geologic Feasibility Study, March 2006
4. Earth Investigation Consultants - Engineering Geologic Feasibility Study, Revised September 2006
5. Ralph Osterling, Consultants, Inc., Certified Arborist - Heritage Tree Protection Plan & Report, July 2006
6. May & Associates – Biological Site Assessment, March 2006
7. Zander Associates – Additional Studies for Biological Studies, June 2006
8. Zander Associates – Revised Design Causes Updated Biological Studies, January 2007
9. Oberkamper & Associates Civil Engineers, Inc. – Surveying Consultation and Land Coverage Calculation, March 2006
10. FEMA - Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2005. Map of Approximate Locations of 100-year Floor Areas
11. North Coast County Water District - Urban Water Management Plan 2006-2010, December 2005
12. Golden Gate National Recreation Area – Review of Proposed Residence, August 2006
13. Hexagon Transportation Consultants, Inc. – Qualitative Traffic Analysis for the Proposed Single-Family Home on Juanita Avenue in Pacifica, February, 2007

Contact

Kathryn Farbstein, Assistant Planner
 City of Pacifica
 1800 Francisco Blvd.
 Pacifica, CA 94044
 (650) 738-7341

Attachments

- a. Land Use and Zoning Maps
- b. Project Site with Access Roads and Building Area
- c. Subject Site and Vallemar Neighborhood to the South