



---

## INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST/ NEGATIVE DECLARATION

---

Prepared For:

**ORDINANCE REQUIRING A SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR  
SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLINGS OVER A CERTAIN SIZE  
CITY OF PACIFICA -- CITYWIDE**

Date Prepared:

**June 18, 2008**

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: June 18, 2008

**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: Ordinance Requiring a Site Development Permit for Single-Family Dwellings Over a Certain Size

Lead Agency: City of Pacifica      Contact Person: Michael Crabtree, Planning Director  
 170 Santa Maria Ave.      (650) 738-7341  
 Pacifica, CA 94044

Project Sponsor/Owner: City of Pacifica  
 170 Santa Maria Avenue  
 Pacifica, CA 94044

Project Location: City of Pacifica--Citywide

General Plan Designation/Zoning Classification: The proposed Ordinance will apply only to those parcels in the City of Pacifica ("City") where the General Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan (LCP) would permit single-family residential development on lots of 5,000 square feet or greater, and that have zoning designations where such development is:

- (1) a "permitted use" under the zoning provisions of the Municipal Code ("Code"). These zoning districts are R-1: Single-Family Residential District (Code Title 9, Chapter 4, Article 4.1), R-2: Two-Family Residential District (Article 5) and R-1-H: Single-Family Residential Hillside District (Article 9.5), and may also include P-D: Planned-Development District (Article 22) and HPD: Hillside Preservation District (Article 22.5); or
- (2) a "conditional use" under the zoning provisions of the Code. These zoning districts are R-3: Multiple-Family Residential District (Article 6), R-3/L.D.: Multiple-Family Density Residential District (Article 6.5), R-3-G: Multiple-Family Garden Residential District (Article 7), R-3.1: Multiple-Family Residential District (Article 8), R-5: High-Rise Apartment District (Article 9), Agricultural District (Article 19), and R-M: Resource Management District (Article 21.5), and may also include P-D: Planned-Development District (Article 22) and HPD: Hillside Preservation District (Article 22.5).

It is estimated that about 40 percent of the City falls within these zoning designations and, thus, would be affected by the Ordinance.

Any proposed single-family residential development on lots smaller than 5,000 square feet (which is a smaller than standard

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

lot size), or in an area where such development is not permitted already requires discretionary approval of the Planning Commission under the existing Code provisions. Any proposed single-family residential development on a parcel zoned R-1-H: Single-Family Residential Hillside District (Code Title 9, Chapter 4, Article 9.5) also already requires a site development permit before a building permit may be issued.

Project Description: The proposed project is the adoption of an Ordinance that would require the City’s Planning Commission to approve a site development permit prior to issuance of a building permit for new construction of a single-family dwelling greater than a certain floor area, or a structural alteration to an existing single-family dwelling greater than a certain floor area, on lots of a standard size (5,000 square feet) or larger (herein, “the Ordinance”). The Ordinance would not apply to lots less than 5,000 square feet; development on such non-standard lots is already subject to discretionary approvals.

Over recent years in Pacifica and elsewhere, homes of a certain size (so-called “mega-homes” and “monster homes”) have been developed such that the floor area in such homes, and as a result the homes themselves, are disproportionately large with respect both to the lots on which they are located and to the neighborhoods in which they are situated. Such homes can have an adverse impact on the character of existing neighborhoods; be aesthetically jarring and unattractive; unduly impair access to daylight, sunshine, and views; and compromise privacy. As such, they are at odds with the health, safety and general welfare of the public.

Under the current Code, these homes require a building permit prior to construction, but do not necessarily require a site development permit. Issuance of a building permit is ministerial and there is no requirement that neighbors of the proposed home receive any notice of the project before it is approved and construction begins.

The purpose of the Ordinance would be to require that the City’s site development permit procedures apply prior to the issuance of a building permit for homes of a certain size, so that the community and affected neighbors may be notified, and a public hearing may be held to determine whether such homes should be approved, and whether reasonable conditions should be imposed to eliminate or adequately mitigate any adverse impacts. The Ordinance would also require the placement of story poles that would give an indication of the potential visual impacts a new house or an addition to an existing home would have on the surrounding neighborhood.

The Ordinance assumes a single-family dwelling threshold of 3,000 square feet of floor area and 800 square feet of garage area for a 5,000 square foot lot, or a floor area ratio (FAR) of 60%. At this standard-sized floor area and garage area on this standard-sized lot, no site development permit would be required under the Ordinance, although the existing provisions of the Code and other federal, state and local law would continue to apply.

For any proposed single-family residence with a floor area greater than 3,000 square feet (with any portion of garage area that exceeds 800 square feet counting towards floor area) on a standard-sized lot or larger, the Ordinance would apply a formula to give a “credit” or a “bonus” amount of floor area that would be allowed before triggering the requirement to receive approval of a site development permit. That is, larger homes would be permitted on larger lots before a site development permit would be required. The existing provisions of the Code and other federal, state and local law would continue to apply.

This formula is as follows:

$$T + F (\sqrt{L - S}) = M$$

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

And the formula terms are defined as follows:

- M = Maximum floor area that would be permitted without triggering Planning Commission review of a site development permit;
- T = Floor area threshold for a standard lot, which is 3,000 square feet;
- S = Standard lot size, which is 5,000 square feet;
- F = Factor representing the multiplier, which is 12;
- L = Actual lot size in square feet.

Here is how the formula would work:

T is always 3,000 square feet, F is always 12, and S is always 5,000 square feet. The only variable will be L, the size of the lot in question, and the resulting allowable living area, M. Using a 6,000 square feet lot as an example, the formula would work as follows:

- T = 3,000 square feet
- F = 12
- S = 5,000 square feet

- Step #1: L (6,000 square feet) minus S (5,000 square feet) equals 1,000. The square root of 1,000 is 31.6 square feet.
- Step #2: 31.6 square feet multiplied by F (12) is 379.2 square feet.
- Step #3: 379.2 square feet is added to T (3,000 square feet) for a maximum allowable living area without triggering the requirement for a site development permit (M) of 3,379 square feet.

This is how it looks with numbers replacing the letters:

$$3,000 + 12(\sqrt{6,000-5,000}) = 3,379$$

Any proposed single-family dwelling with a floor area greater than 3,379 square feet on a 6,000 square-foot lot would require review and approval of a site development permit by the Planning Commission, in addition to any other existing regulations, before a building permit could be issued. Following are examples of the maximum floor area that would be permitted under the Ordinance without triggering Planning Commission Review (in square feet) for lots of various sizes.

Lot Size (L) (square feet)	Maximum Floor Area (M) (Without Triggering Planning Commission Review) (square feet)
5,000	3,000

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

5,500	3,268
6,000	3,379
6,500	3,465
7,000	3,537
7,500	3,600
8,000	3,657
8,500	3,710
9,000	3,759
9,500	3,805
10,000	3,849
20,000	4,470
40,000	5,244

The Ordinance would not automatically prohibit the construction of large homes. Rather, it would require (1) the applicant to submit an application for a site development permit, (2) the City to provide notice and a public hearing and the receipt of public comment on the permit application, and (3) the opportunity for reasonable conditions to be imposed on the proposed project to eliminate or adequately mitigate any adverse impacts from homes of a certain size. Any specific proposed single-family residential development that requires approval of a site development permit under the Ordinance would be subject to CEQA and any necessary environmental review.

The site development permit process is a part of the City’s existing Zoning Code (Title 9, Chapter 4, Article 32 of the City Municipal Code). The Ordinance would not change this existing process. In general, the site development permit process requires the applicant to file an application with the Planning Commission on a prescribed form, together with the certain supporting as indicated by the Planning Administrator. The Code requires the applicant to submit a fee to cover the costs of such things as field investigations, preparation of reports and site maps, preparation of environmental review, and printing, posting and mailing notices and legal publications. After an application is complete, the Commission gives notice of a public hearing in the newspaper and by mail to neighbors of the proposed project, and holds a public on the application.

Under the existing Code, the Commission may approve, deny or condition the application for a site development permit based on certain findings described in the Code. Of particular relevance for purposes of the proposed Ordinance, the Commission may deny or condition approval of a site development permit if it makes any of the following findings described in existing Code Section 9-4.3204:

...

- (3) That insufficient landscaped areas have been reserved for the purposes of separating or screening service and storage areas from the street and adjoining building sites, breaking up large expanses of paved areas, and separating or screening parking lots from the street and adjoining building areas from paved areas to provide access from buildings to open areas;

...

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

- (4) That the proposed development, as set forth on the plans, will unreasonably restrict or cut out light and air on the property and on other property in the neighborhood, or will hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof;
- ...
- (6) That the proposed development will excessively damage or destroy natural features, including trees, shrubs, creeks, and rocks, and the natural grade of the site, except as provided in the subdivision regulations as set forth in Chapter 1 of Title 10 of this Code;
- (7) That there is insufficient variety in the design of the structure and grounds to avoid monotony in the external appearance;
- (8) That the proposed development is inconsistent with the City’s adopted Design Guidelines; or
- (9) That the proposed development is inconsistent with the General Plan, Local Coastal Plan, or other applicable laws of the City.

An applicant or aggrieved person who is not satisfied with the outcome of the Commission’s decision on the site development permit application may appeal the decision to the City Council.

Site Description: The Ordinance would apply to any proposed single-family dwellings of a certain size on lots of a standard-size (5,000 square feet) or larger on property that is properly zoned for such residential development City-wide. The Ordinance would not apply to lots of less than 5,000 square feet, or lots that are not zoned for residential development.

As described above, the City estimates that approximately 40 percent of the City is zoned for single-family residential development as a “permitted” or “conditional” use.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Because, as described above, the Ordinance would apply to lots of 5,000 square feet or greater and that are zoned for residential development, the land uses surrounding such potential development sites are expected also primarily to be residential uses. The Ordinance would trigger the existing site development permit process for homes of a certain size, which would require surrounding land uses within a certain radius of a proposed development to receive notice of the application.

Other public agency approval(s) required: The City Council is required to introduce the Ordinance at a publicly-notice meeting and then adopt the Ordinance at a publicly-notice meeting. No other public agency approval is required prior to introduction and adoption of the Ordinance. For proposed development subject to the Ordinance, all existing public agency approvals would continue to apply.

**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 type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics



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

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?  | ___ | ___ | ___ | _X_ |
| 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? | ___ | ___ | ___ | _X_ |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural Community conservation plan?   | ___ | ___ | ___ | _X_ |

Discussion of Evaluation: The Ordinance would be incorporated into the City's existing Zoning Code and does not include any elements that would change or eliminate the existing requirement that all proposed projects meet the City's existing General Plan, Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan and Zoning Code regulations. The Ordinance is consistent with all of the City's existing land use plans and policies. Some of the policies of the City's General Plan Housing Element state that housing opportunities and a choice of housing types and densities should be provided. The Ordinance would not prohibit residential development. It would only require approval of a Site Development Permit for houses of a certain size.

The Ordinance would not result in any physical division of any established community. Indeed, the Ordinance is intended to preserve neighborhood continuity and character. The Ordinance would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural Community conservation plan. There is no habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan that exists on properties zoned for residential development.

The requirement in the Ordinance that proposed development that triggers the site development permit requirement temporarily install story poles on the project site prior to the Commission's hearing on the application is not inconsistent with any existing land use plan or policy.

Mitigation: None required.

**II. POPULATION AND HOUSING.** Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly

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

(for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

___	___	___	<u>X</u>
-----	-----	-----	----------

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

___	___	___	<u>X</u>
-----	-----	-----	----------

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

___	___	___	<u>X</u>
-----	-----	-----	----------

Discussion of Evaluation: The Ordinance would implement a formula requiring homes of a certain size to receive a site development permit before a building permit may be issued. Because the Ordinance would apply only to proposed new construction and new additions to existing housing, it would not eliminate any existing housing in the City or displace any people currently living in the City. Thus, it would not necessitate construction of any replacement housing to compensate for loss or displacement of existing housing.

The Ordinance would neither encourage nor generate development of any type, and, thus, would not induce any population growth.

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

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

or property? \_\_\_    \_\_\_    \_\_\_    X

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? \_\_\_    \_\_\_    \_\_\_    X

Discussion of Evaluation: Adoption of the Ordinance would have no effect on any existing exposure of people or structures to geologic hazards.

The Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City's adoption of the Ordinance would not create any new substantial risk to life or property, or promote any physical alteration of land. The Ordinance also does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate any current requirements that proposed projects meet existing geologic and soil hazards regulations.

The requirement in the Ordinance that proposed development that triggers the site development permit requirement temporarily install story poles on the project site prior to the Commission's hearing on the application would not result in any significant geologic impact because story poles are lightweight temporary structures that do not require any deep anchoring into the soil.

Mitigation: None required.

**IV. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.** Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? \_\_\_    \_\_\_    \_\_\_    X

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)? \_\_\_    \_\_\_    \_\_\_    X

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? \_\_\_    \_\_\_    \_\_\_    X

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? \_\_\_    \_\_\_    \_\_\_    X

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

Adoption of the Ordinance would have no effect on any existing exposure of people or structures to flood or tsunami hazards.

The Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City's adoption of the Ordinance would not create any new water quality pollutants, demand for groundwater, change to drainage patterns, storm water runoff, or flood or tsunami hazard. In addition, the Ordinance does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing regulatory standards concerning hydrology and water quality.

Mitigation: None required.

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				

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

Adoption of the Ordinance would have no effect on any existing levels of air pollutants and existing air quality.

The Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City's adoption of the Ordinance would not affect implementation of applicable air quality plans, violate air quality standards, result in any emissions, expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, or create any odors. The Ordinance also does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing regulatory standards concerning air quality.

Mitigation: None required.

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)?	___	___	___	<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?	___	___	___	<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>

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

Discussion of Evaluation: Adoption of the Ordinance would have no effect on any existing levels of traffic.

The Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City's adoption of the Ordinance would not cause any increase in traffic, change any existing level of service, have any affect on air traffic patterns, change emergency access, change parking capacity or conflict with any alternative transportation policies, plans or programs. The Ordinance also does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing transportation and circulation regulations.

The requirement in the Ordinance that proposed development that triggers the site development permit requirement temporarily install story poles on the project site prior to the Commission's hearing on the application would not result in any significant traffic impact because the placement of lightweight temporary poles would be less distracting to motorists than a larger permanent structure.

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?   | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or   |   |   |   |          |

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

ordinance? \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_X\_

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: The Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City’s adoption of the Ordinance would not cause any effect on protected species, effect on habitat or wetland, interfere with species movement, conflict with policies and ordinances to protect biological resources, or conflict with any habitat plan. The Ordinance does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing biological resource protection regulations.

The requirement in the Ordinance that proposed development that triggers the site development permit requirement temporarily install story poles on the project site prior to the Commission’s hearing on the application would not result in any significant biological impact because the story poles are lightweight temporary structures that do not require deep anchoring into the soil. As such, they would not modify any sensitive plant and/or species habitat or interfere with any migratory wildlife. Furthermore, existing applicable regulations relating to protection of species, habitat and wetlands would continue to apply to the temporary installation of any story poles.

Mitigation: None required.

**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? \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_X\_

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? \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_X\_

Discussion of Evaluation: The Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City’s adoption of the Ordinance would not affect any known and/or available mineral resources. Moreover, because the Ordinance applies only to certain residential development, there are no mineral resource recovery activities in areas of the City that would be affected by the Ordinance (i.e., in areas where there would be proposed additions to existing residential development or new residential development).

Additionally, the Ordinance does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate current requirements that proposed projects be consistent with existing regulations concerning the preservation of mineral resources. Consequently, adoption of the Ordinance would not result in the loss of availability of any mineral resources or mineral resource recovery sites.

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

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 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 Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City's adoption of the Ordinance would not cause any new significant hazard to the public from hazardous materials, result in hazardous pollutant emissions, impair any emergency response plan, or increase exposure to wildland fires. The Ordinance does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing hazardous materials regulations.

Because the Ordinance would apply only to parcels zoned for single-family residential development, it would not

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

apply to any site that is listed as a hazardous materials site. There are no parcels potentially subject to the Ordinance within two miles of a public airport or the vicinity of a private airstrip.

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 public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	___	___	___	<u>X</u>
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?	___	___	___	<u>X</u>

Discussion of Evaluation: The Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City's adoption of the Ordinance would not expose people to noise or vibration, or change ambient noise levels.

Because the Ordinance would apply only to parcels zoned for single-family residential development, there are no parcels potentially subject to the Ordinance within two miles of a public airport or the vicinity of a private airstrip. The Ordinance does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing noise regulations

The requirement in the Ordinance that proposed development that triggers the site development permit requirement temporarily install story poles on the project site prior to the Commission's hearing on the application would not result in any significant noise impact because the noise created by the installation of story poles would be minor and short-term.

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

Mitigation: None required.

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 maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:

- |                             |   |   |   |          |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|----------|
| a) Fire protection?         | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| b) Police protection?       | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| c) Schools?                 | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| d) Parks?                   | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |
| e) Other public facilities? | — | — | — | <u>X</u> |

Discussion of Evaluation: The Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City's adoption of the Ordinance would not affect provision of fire or police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities. The Ordinance does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing regulations pertaining to the provision of public services, including any requirement that new development pay any assessment or fee to cover its contribution to the provision of such services.

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> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City's adoption of the Ordinance would not affect provision of wastewater treatment services, storm water drainage capacity, water supply resources, or landfill or solid waste capacity. The Ordinance does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing regulations pertaining to the provision of utilities, including any requirement that new development pay any assessment or fee to cover its contribution to the provision of such services.

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 Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City's adoption of the Ordinance would not affect scenic vistas, scenic resources, existing visual character, or create a new source of light or glare.

The Ordinance does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing regulations pertaining to the aesthetic, scenic and visual resources. In particular, The Ordinance does not change or eliminate any existing requirement that a proposed project be consistent with the City's adopted Design Guidelines. In fact, the Ordinance

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

would reduce aesthetic impacts associated with development by requiring proposed residential development that exceeds a certain size to receive approval of a site development permit by the Planning Commission. Such permits are conditioned on a finding that the proposed development is consistent with the City’s Design Guidelines. In addition, the permit must be denied if the City finds:

- (1) That the location, size, and intensity of the proposed operation will create a hazardous or inconvenient vehicular or pedestrian traffic pattern, taking into account the proposed use as compared with the general character and intensity of the neighborhood;*
- (2) That the accessibility of off-street parking areas and the relation of parking areas with respect to traffic on adjacent streets will create a hazardous or inconvenient condition to adjacent or surrounding uses;*
- (3) That insufficient landscaped areas have been reserved for the purposes of separating or screening service and storage areas from the street and adjoining building sites, breaking up large expanses of paved areas, and separating or screening parking lots from the street and adjoining building areas from paved areas to provide access from buildings to open areas;*
- (4) That the proposed development, as set forth on the plans, will unreasonably restrict or cut out light and air on the property and on other property in the neighborhood, or will hinder or discourage the appropriate development and use of land and buildings in the neighborhood, or impair the value thereof;*
- (5) That the improvement of any commercial or industrial structure, as shown on the elevations as submitted, is substantially detrimental to the character or value of an adjacent R District area;*
- (6) That the proposed development will excessively damage or destroy natural features, including trees, shrubs, creeks, and rocks, and the natural grade of the site, except as provided in the subdivision regulations as set forth in Chapter 1 of Title 10 of this Code;*
- (7) That there is insufficient variety in the design of the structure and grounds to avoid monotony in the external appearance;*
- (8) That the proposed development is inconsistent with the City’s adopted Design Guidelines;*
- (9) That the proposed development is inconsistent with the General Plan, Local Coastal Plan, or other applicable laws of the City.*

Findings Numbers 1, 4, 7, and 8 would ensure that new homes and additions to existing homes do not overwhelm surrounding development and are not out of character with the neighborhood. Therefore, the Ordinance will reduce any potential aesthetic impacts.

The only new potential impact associated with the Ordinance would be the requirement that proposed projects that are seeking a site development permit must place story poles that would give an indication of the potential visual impacts a new house or an addition to an existing home that exceeds the thresholds of the formula would have on the surrounding neighborhood. Because the Ordinance would not require all proposed residential development projects to seek a site development permit (and thus would not require such projects to use story poles) and because the Ordinance would only require the story poles to be in place for a short duration, any aesthetic impact from the erection of the story poles would be minor and of a very short duration. Such a minor and short-term impact would not be significant because the story poles would be removed once they served their purpose.

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

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: The Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City’s adoption of the Ordinance would not affect historical, archaeological, paleontological, or unique geologic resources, and would not disturb any human remains. The Ordinance does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing regulations pertaining to the preservation and protection of cultural resources, including human remains.

The requirement in the Ordinance that proposed development that triggers the site development permit requirement temporarily install story poles on the project site prior to the Commission’s hearing on the application would not result in any significant impact to cultural resources because the temporarily placement of story poles would not require significant ground disturbance such as deep anchoring. The top soil would only be minimally affected by these temporarily lightweight structures. Furthermore, existing applicable regulations relating to protection of cultural resources would continue to apply to the temporary installation of any story poles, no poles would be erected in any site containing known cultural resources.

Mitigation: None required.

**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 Williamson Act contract?   | ___ | ___ | ___ | <u>X</u> |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which,  |     |     |     |          |

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

due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?

—	—	—	<u>X</u>
---	---	---	----------

Discussion of Evaluation: Because the Ordinance would apply only to proposed single-family residential development in areas properly zoned for such development and there are no agricultural resources in areas zoned for such development, the Ordinance would not result in any impact on 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 Ordinance would require approval of a site development permit for certain proposed single-family residential development. The Ordinance would not encourage, promote or guarantee any new development and therefore the City's adoption of the Ordinance would not affect recreational resources or require the construction of new recreation facilities. The Ordinance does not include any provisions that would change or eliminate existing regulations pertaining to the provision of recreation resources, including any requirement that new development pay any assessment or fee to cover its contribution to the provision of such services.

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

—	—	—	<u>X</u>
---	---	---	----------

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

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

                

Discussion of Evaluation: The Ordinance would not result in or encourage a higher rate of development or any specific type of development. Further, there are no provisions in the Ordinance concerning project location or development potential of improved or unimproved lots. Moreover, because the Ordinance would not change or eliminate the requirement that applicable projects comply with the City’s zoning code, General Plan, Local Coastal Plan or any other applicable regulations, its implementation would not create any adverse impacts. The Ordinance does not have the potential to degrade environmental quality or affect or eliminate any wildlife habitats, populations, ranges or communities. No cumulative impacts of any sort would be created by the Ordinance nor would there be any adverse impacts on human beings. The provision that a new home or an addition to an existing home that exceeds a certain size be reviewed by the Planning Commission would have no significant impacts.

Mitigation:      None required.

**XVIII. EARLIER ANALYSES.**

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case a brief discussion should identify the following (attached additional sheets if necessary):

- a) Earlier analyses used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
- b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
- c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

Discussion of Evaluation: None.

Potentially Significant <u>Impact</u>	Less Than Significant With Mitigation <u>Incorporated</u>	Less Than Significant <u>Impact</u>	No <u>Impact</u>
---	---	---	---------------------

### LIST OF REFERENCES AND CONTACTS

1. City of Pacifica                      General Plan, as amended to June 1993.
2. City of Pacifica                      Zoning Code, August 1992.
3. City of Pacifica                      Local Coastal land use Plan, August 1992