



**PROPOSED MITIGATED NEGATIVE  
DECLARATION**

New Single-Family Residence  
1829 Kirkby Road

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>The following Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.</p> |   |
| <b>Project Title/Common Name:</b>  | New Single-Family Residence   |
| <b>Project Location:</b>   | 1829 Kirkby Road, Glendale, Los Angeles County  |
| <b>Project Description:</b>  | <p>To construct a new two-story, 4,114 square-foot single-family dwelling with an attached 648 square-foot, three-car garage on an approximately 15,880 square-foot lot, zoned R1R (FAR District II). The project includes demolition of the two existing residential structures- a single-family dwelling and accessory living quarters (built circa 1911 and 1924). As proposed, the development will involve grading with a total export of 196 cubic yards of soil. There are a total of fourteen protected indigenous trees (Coast Live Oaks) located on or within twenty feet of the property (eleven located on the project site). Additionally, a portion of the lot is located in a Liquefaction Zone. The proposed single-family dwelling will require approval from the Design Review Board.</p> |
| <b>Project Type:</b>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Project <input type="checkbox"/> Public Project   |
| <b>Project Applicant:</b>  | Vartan Jangozian<br>1224 East Broadway, Suite 202<br>Glendale, CA 91205   |
| <b>Findings:</b>   | <p>The Director of the Community Development, on <b>March 23, 2018</b>, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project as mitigated would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.</p>   |
| <b>Mitigation Measures:</b>  | See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)   |
| <b>Attachments:</b>  | Initial Study Checklist   |
| <b>Contact Person:</b>   | Vista Ezzati, Planning Associate<br>City of Glendale Community Development Department<br>633 East Broadway Room 103<br>Glendale, CA 91206-4386<br>Tel: (818) 937-8180; Fax: (818) 240-0392<br>Email: <a href="mailto:VEzzati@glendaleca.gov">VEzzati@glendaleca.gov</a>   |

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)**

The following mitigation measures shall apply to the proposed single-family residence located at 1829 Kirkby Road to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**BIO - 1** The applicant shall comply with the Urban Forestry Department Comments dated January 2, 2018, which shall include the following:

- Obtain an Indigenous Tree Permit to perform work near and for the removal of four of the indigenous trees.
- The property owner shall work with the AOR to create a reforestation or restoration plan to replace the four trees being removed.
- The AOR shall provide the Urban Forestry Department with a report that assesses the appraised value of the protected trees on the property that are to be preserved.

**Monitoring Action:** Plan review; Site inspection

**Timing:** Prior to issuance of development permits (plan review). During all construction activities (site inspection).

**Responsibility:** Director of Public Works; Arborist of Record (AOR)

**BIO - 2** The applicant shall comply with all of the tree protection measures listed on the Indigenous Tree Protection Measures sheet that will be supplied with the Indigenous Tree Permit and all applicable construction guidelines included in the Indigenous Tree Report prepared by Arsen Margossian, dated November 24, 2017.

**Monitoring Action:** Plan review; Site inspection

**Timing:** Prior to issuance of development permits (plan review). During all site preparation activities and construction (site inspection).

**Responsibility:** Director of Public Works; Arborist of Record (AOR)

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

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

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

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_



**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

New Single-Family Residence

1829 Kirkby Road

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| 1.  | <b>Project Title:</b> New Single-Family Residence   |
| 2.  | <b>Lead Agency Name and Address:</b><br>City of Glendale Community Development Department<br>Planning Division<br>633 East Broadway, Room 103<br>Glendale, CA 91206   |
| 3.  | <b>Contact Person and Phone Number:</b><br>Vista Ezzati, Planning Associate<br><br>Tel: (818) 937-8180<br>Fax: (818) 240-0392   |
| 4.  | <b>Project Location:</b> 1829 Kirkby Road, Glendale, Los Angeles County   |
| 5.  | <b>Project Sponsor's Name and Address:</b><br>Vartan Jangozian<br>1224 East Broadway, Suite 202<br>Glendale, CA 91205<br>Tel: (818) 956-0570  |
| 6.  | <b>General Plan Designation:</b> Low Density Residential  |
| 7.  | <b>Zoning:</b> R1R (Restricted Residential) Zone, Floor Area District II  |
| 8.  | <b>Description of the Project:</b> To construct a new two-story, 4,114 square-foot single-family dwelling with an attached 648 square-foot, three-car garage on an approximately 15,880 square-foot lot, zoned R1R (FAR District II). The project includes demolition of the two existing residential structures -a single-family dwelling and accessory living quarters (built circa 1911 and 1924). As proposed, the development will involve grading with a total export of 196 cubic yards of soil. There are a total of fourteen protected indigenous trees (Coast Live Oaks) located on or within twenty feet of the property (eleven located on the project site). Additionally, a portion of the lot is located in a Liquefaction Zone. The proposed single-family dwelling will require approval from the Design Review Board. |
| 9.  | <b>Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:</b><br><i>North:</i> R1R Restricted Residential, Floor Area District II/ Single-Family Residential<br><i>South:</i> R1R Restricted Residential, Floor Area District II/ Single-Family Residential<br><i>East:</i> R1R Restricted Residential, Floor Area District II/ Single-Family Residential<br><i>West:</i> R1R Restricted Residential, Floor Area District II/ Single-Family Residential   |
| 10. | <b>Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).</b><br>None.  |

**11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:**

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

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

**LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Prepared by: *Nista Eggatz*

3/23/18

Reviewed by: *[Signature]* for Yilia Zemaitaitis

Date: 3/23/18

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

Director of Community Development: *[Signature]*

Date: 3/23/18

**A. AESTHETICS**

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

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

**No Impact.** Scenic vistas are protected vital or sensitive open space areas that include ridgelines, canyons, streams, geologic formations, watersheds and historic, cultural, aesthetic and ecologically significant areas. No scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element (January, 1993), exist within, or within view of the Project site. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would result from project implementation.

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

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

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

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is located in the Verdugo Woodlands neighborhood in the City of Glendale, in a heavily-wooded area approximately 375 feet from a major arterial - North Verdugo Road. The surrounding properties are zoned R1R and consist of single-family residences, though there are multi-family zoned properties nearby along North Verdugo Road, zoned R-2250 (Medium Density Residential). The subject property is currently developed with two residential structures - a single-family residence built circa 1911 that is now considered an accessory living quarters, and the main house that was built in 1924.

The lot has an irregular shape with double frontage on Kirkby Road to the south and to the north-east. The lot slopes up from Kirkby Road with the two residential structures sited towards the northeast portion of the site where there are flat, terraced areas. The site features natural vegetation, river rock retaining walls, and a total of fourteen indigenous (Coast Live Oak) on the lot and within twenty feet of the site. Currently, there are a total of eleven Coast Live Oak trees located on the subject property and the development of the site will require the removal of four of these trees.

The proposed project is to construct a new two-story, 4,114 square-foot single-family dwelling with an attached 648 square-foot, three-car garage on an approximately 15,880 square-foot lot zoned, R1R (FAR District II). The proposal includes demolition of the two existing residential structures (built circa 1911 and 1924). A total of 196 cubic yards of soil will be graded and exported offsite to allow for the construction of the new house.

The proposed single-family dwelling will be constructed with materials, such as smooth stucco, cement-board siding, and a stone veneer base with a river-rock design to complement the natural setting of the site, as well as the surrounding neighborhood. The project will require approval from the Design Review Board to ensure less than significant impacts to the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

As a result, impacts to visual character and quality of the site are anticipated to be less than significant.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Day and nighttime lighting for the project will not increase as a result of the proposed project, but would be similar to the existing single-family uses within the project vicinity. Because the surrounding area is already developed with single-family dwellings, less than significant impacts associated with lighting would occur.

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

**B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES**

| <i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i> | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |
| 5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?  |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |

**1) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

**No Impact.** There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance within or adjacent to the proposed Project site, and no agricultural activities take place on the Project site. No impact would occur.

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

**2) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

**No Impact.** No portion of the Project site is proposed to include agricultural zoning designations or uses, nor do any such uses exist within the City under the current General Plan and zoning. There are no Williamson Act contracts in effect for the Project site or surrounding vicinity. No conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contracts would result. No impact would occur.

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

**3) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)?**

**No Impact.** There is no existing zoning of forest land or timberland in the City. No impact would occur.

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

**4) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

**No Impact.** There is no forestland within the City of Glendale. No forestland would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impact would occur.

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

**5) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?**

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

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

**C. AIR QUALITY**

| <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i> | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?   |                                |   | X                            |           |

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

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is located within the City of Glendale, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the agency responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. The most recent comprehensive plan fully approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

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

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

Population growth associated with the Project is included in the Southern California Associations of Government (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The Project does not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG forecast, because the Project is consistent with the General Plan and therefore is included in SCAG’s growth projections. Consequently, implementation of the Project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts and with applicable air quality plans. No impact would occur.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project is to construct a new two-story, 4,114 square-foot single-family dwelling with an attached 648 square-foot, three-car garage. A total of 196 cubic yards of soil will be graded and exported offsite. The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) was used to estimate air quality impacts during the construction and operation stages of the project. Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for



construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results are attached. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response C-1 and C-2 above.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact:** Sensitive receptors are located near the Project site that include single-family dwellings surrounding the project site. The applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 - Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the impact related to construction-related impacts. As a result, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration or create emissions that exceed known thresholds. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction activity associated with the project may generate detectable odors from equipment exhaust. However, any detectable odors or equipment exhaust would be associated with initial construction and would be considered transitory and/or short-term. Therefore, less than significant construction related odor impacts are anticipated to occur from the project.

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

**D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

| <b>Would the project:</b>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 3. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?   |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  |                                | X   |                              |           |
| 6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? |                                |   |                              | X         |

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

**No Impact.** The Verdugo Woodlands area is not identified as a Significant Ecological area in the Open Space and Conservation Element. The proposal to construct a new single-family residence would not result in any adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant. See section D-1 herein above.

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

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is neither in proximity to, nor does it contain, a wetland habitat. Therefore, the project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), through direct removal filing, hydrological interruption, or other means. No impact would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project site located in a developed area where there are constraints to wildlife movement under the existing conditions. Existing development in the area limits wildlife movement. Consequently, wildlife movement on the project site is limited to only local movement of wildlife within the immediate vicinity. The proposal to construct a new single-family residence would not result in any significant barrier to wildlife moving through the area, any more so than the existing condition. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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

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

**No Impact.** The Glendale Municipal Code, Section 12.44 protects six different native or “indigenous” species of trees that include Coast Live Oak, Valley Oak, Mesa Oak, Scrub Oak, California Sycamore, and California Bay.

The proposed new single-family residence is on a hillside property on the east side of the Verdugo Woodlands neighborhood. The project site contains a largely intact oak tree cover that contributes to the continuous forest cover in this portion of the Verdugo Woodland neighborhood. The site features two residential structures (a single-family dwelling and accessory living quarters) and a driveway on the upper portion of the lot, and a series of terraces and landscaping on the remainder of the site. The open space on this project site, as well as the surrounding properties, contains mature indigenous trees with a few non-native trees. An Indigenous Tree Report (dated November 24, 2017) was prepared for this project by the Arborist of Record (AOR), Arsen Margossian. The City’s Urban Forestry Department (“Forestry”) reviewed the project plans and the Indigenous Tree Report, visited the project site, and provided the following comments.

There are 14 indigenous protected trees (Coast Live Oak) on the property, or within 20 feet of the site. Eleven of these indigenous trees are located on the project site at 1829 Kirkby Road, one is located at 1825 Kirkby Road adjacent to the property line, and two are located at 1841 Kirkby Road. Eight of the 14 are large, mature Oak trees that contribute to the closed forest canopy of the neighborhood. The remaining six of the indigenous trees are small and suppressed beneath the crowns of the larger neighboring trees.

Three protected Oak trees are proposed for removal (Tree # 85, 86, 87) because they are located within the footprint of the proposed house. A fourth protected Oak tree is being proposed for removal (Tree #91) due to the presence of significant decay at the base of the tree. Forestry can support these removals and would issue a removal permit with the condition that the permit not be issued until all other City approvals are made and the property owner, with their AOR, creates a reforestation or restoration plan to replace the four trees that are proposed for removal. The landscape plans identify three new Oak trees proposed to be planted with the development of the site. Forestry would require at least eight replacement trees be planted (a 2:1 replanting: removal ratio). If there is inadequate space for all eight replacement trees on the property, then the property owner will be required to pay for the cost of the City to purchase the replacement trees and plant them elsewhere in the City.

The proposed single-family dwelling and site improvements occupy a significant portion of the open space on the property. As proposed, the construction of the single-family dwelling and site improvements would result in construction activities, including demolition and excavation, occurring within the dripline of seven protected Oak trees; six located on the property and one located near the property line of the address to the West. Of particular concern for negative impacts to nearby indigenous Oak tree are:

- Excavation and grading for the new single-family residence is proposed within 10 feet of the tree trunks in the cluster of Oak trees on the terraced slope of the west side of the property (Trees # 88, 89, 90). It is difficult to effectively protect a tree with construction occurring this close to the trunk of the tree, and damage to the current root systems of these trees is a concern. Forestry requires significant tree protection measures be installed to protect these trees during construction (i.e., temporary chain link fencing).
- The proposal involves maintaining the existing driveway accessed from the northwest portion of the site, and will include the replacement of the existing surface material (not an expansion). Forestry

supports the replacement of the surface material for the driveway provided that protective measures are installed to prevent damage to the nearby Oak trees (Trees #93, 94, & 95).

- There is proposed grading (fill) within the dripline of Tree #93 for a portion of the new house and driveway that would bury a portion of the root system in an unspecified amount of fill soil. The indigenous tree report does not mention this potential impact, despite Forestry staff specifically highlighting concerns about the construction of the driveway. If built as proposed, there is no way to reduce or eliminate the potential damage caused by the burying of this portion of the tree root system.
- Forestry previously suggested that the size of the pool and patio be reduced or removed to minimize damage to Tree #92. The size of the proposed pool has been reduced in the current proposal so that it is located further away from the dripline of Tree #92, yet the footprint of the patio is unchanged. Forestry can support this revision but would prefer to see the patio moved further away from the trunk of Tree #92.
- Clearance pruning will be required for Trees #88 & 89 in order to provide adequate clearance for construction activities and the finished house.

Previous experience with hillside construction near protected trees has shown that when construction occurs within 10 feet of the tree trunk that nearby trees are inevitably damaged by construction even with tree protection measures installed. The layout of the house is largely unchanged from the previous submission and Forestry continues to recommend moving the house further away from the nearby Oak as the best method for reducing potential damage to these trees. Since the property owner does not intend to change site plan or the layout of the house, Forestry will require the property owner to have the AOR appraise the value to the protected trees on the property that will be preserved. Furthermore, an indigenous tree permit will be required in order to remove the four trees and perform work near the remaining ten trees. The indigenous tree permit will not be issued until the plans have been approved by other City Departments.

***Mitigation Measures:*** Compliance with mitigation measure BIO-1 and BIO-2 will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant.

BIO-1 The applicant shall comply with the Urban Forestry Department Comments dated January 2, 2018, which shall include the following:

- Obtain an Indigenous Tree Permit to perform work near and for the removal of 4 of the indigenous trees.
- The property owner shall work with the AOR to create a reforestation or restoration plan to replace the four trees being removed.
- The AOR shall provide the Urban Forestry Department with a report that assesses the appraised value of the protected trees on the property that are to be preserved.

BIO-2 The applicant shall comply with all of the tree protection measures listed on the Indigenous Tree Protection Measures sheet that will be supplied with the Indigenous Tree permit and all applicable construction guidelines included in the Indigenous Tree Report prepared by Arsen Margossian, dated November 24, 2017.

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

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

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

**E. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines §15064.5?    |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15064.5? |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?                       |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 4. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?  |                                |   | X                            |           |

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project site is currently developed with two residential structures: a single-family residence built circa 1911 that would now be classified as “accessory living quarters”, and the main single-family residence that was built in 1924. The original residential structure built circa 1911 is located towards the northeast (rear) of the property, and is less than 550 square feet in size. The original owner, builder and actual year built of this structure are unknown due to lack of archival evidence. The main single-family residence built in 1924 is located in front of the original 1911 structure and is less than 700 square feet in size. The two existing residential structures are not currently listed on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources, the California Register of Historical Resources, or the National Register of Historic Places. A Historic Resource Assessment was prepared for the property at 1829 Kirkby Road by Arroyo Resources, dated May 31, 2017 (Exhibit 2). This assessment determined that the two structures do not meet the criteria for any National, State, or Local register for historic resources. The two structures are not a distinctive example of the Craftsman style as they are both simple Craftsman cottages with minimal detailing characteristic of the style, and no evidence was found indicating the site is associated with important events or people in history. As such, the structures would not be considered a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No significant impacts to a historical resource would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Prehistoric and historic archaeological sites are not known to exist within the project area. The City’s Open Space and Conservation Element indicate that no significant archaeological sites have been identified in this area of Glendale. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation would have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and

Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of notice.

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

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

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

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of the notice. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the Project site or surrounding area. However, impacts would be potentially significant if human remains were to be encountered during excavation and grading activities. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or reburial). With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact would occur.

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

**F. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                                |   |                              |           |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. |                                |   | X                            |           |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?   |                                |   | X                            |           |

| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| iv) Landslides?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code (2001), creating substantial risks to life or property?   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?  |                                |   |                              | X         |

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

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

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

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

- ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

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

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The southeasterly portion of the project site has been identified by the City's Safety Element to be located within a liquefaction zone. Per the Report of Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Advanced Geotechniques (dated November 16, 2016), a portion of the proposed residence is located in the identified liquefaction zone area. The report states that liquefaction normally occurs where loose, saturated sand layers occur at shallow depths which are typically less than 40 feet. The top zone of the site, within the foundation stress influence zone, consists of bedrock without groundwater. Given this, the report indicates that the chance of structural damage resulting from soil

liquefaction is remote at the project site. Therefore, less than significant impact related to liquefaction is anticipated.

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

**iv) Landslides?**

**No Impact.** The project site is not located within a landslide hazard potential area, as indicated by the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). No impacts related to landslides would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Construction activity associated with project development may result in wind and water driven erosion of soils due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short-term in nature since the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities. Further, as part of the Project, the applicant would be required to adhere to Glendale Municipal Code Chapter 13.42 requirements and prepare and administer a plan that effectively provides for a minimum storm water quality protection throughout Project construction. The plan would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant. In addition, the applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403 - Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the impact related to soil erosion to less than significant.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Per the Report of Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Advanced Geotechniques (dated November 16, 2016), four test pits were excavated to a maximum depth of seven feet below existing grades. Based on the derived data, the report states that the proposed project, with adherence to the recommendations in the report, will be safe for the proposed structures against the hazard of liquefaction, landslide, settlement, or slippage. The report also states that the proposed development will not have an adverse influence on the geologic stability of properties outside of the project site. As indicated in response F-1 (iii), the southeasterly portion of the project site has been identified by the City's Safety Element to be located within a liquefaction zone. A portion of the building footprint is located within this identified liquefaction zone. The report states that liquefaction normally occurs where loose, saturated sand layers occur at shallow depths which are typically less than 40 feet. The top zone of the site, within the foundation stress influence zone, consists of bedrock without groundwater. Given this, the report indicates that structural damage resulting from soil liquefaction is remote at the project site, and less than significant impact related to liquefaction is anticipated.

Observation made by Advanced Geotechniques on-site of the cut slopes, as well as review of published geologic maps, indicates that the investigated portions of the project site are underlain by crystalline basement rock of the Cretaceous age. The fill soil consist of moderately compact, light-brown to brown, somewhat porous, slightly silt, fine to coarse grained sand containing gravel and cobble size clasts of granite rock. The fill rests on natural soil and on rock, and generally covers the level pad to depths of two to seven feet. The fill soils encountered in Test Pit #4 was more than seven feet thick and the bottom of



the fill was not reached during the excavation. The colluvial soil consists of medium dense, brown, somewhat porous, slightly silty, gravel-like, fine to coarse grained sand and was encountered during excavation for Test Pit #2. The basement rock was encountered during excavation of Test Pit #1-3. The basement rock consists of firm to moderately hard, yellow-brown to orange-brown, massive, medium-to-fine grained granodiorite. Generally, the rock is slightly to moderately fractured and moderately to highly weathered. The basement rock was found to be very firm to hard and is expected to provide adequate support for the proposed development of the site. As a result, no significant impacts would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The soils underlying the project site and surrounding area are considered to have a low expansion potential. Additionally, design and construction of the proposed project would comply with applicable building codes, which are intended to minimize damage due to geologic hazards. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soil would be less than significant.

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

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

**No Impact.** Septic tanks will not be used in the project. The project would not connect to and use the existing sewage conveyance system. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

**G. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

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

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

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

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution

from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. GHG as defined under AB 32 includes: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020 by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

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

At this time no air agency, including the SCAQMD, has adopted applicable project-level significance thresholds for GHGs emissions. AB 32 did not set a significance threshold for GHG emissions, although EPA, CARB or another agency may issue regulations at some point which may set forth significance criteria for CEQA analysis. In the interim, none of the CEQA Guidelines, the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the Air Quality Management Plan, or the SCAQMD set forth applicable significance thresholds for GHG emissions.

Due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change, there is no basis for concluding that the project's very small and essentially temporary (primarily from construction) increase in emissions could cause a measurable increase in global GHG emissions necessary to force global climate change.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) clarifies that the effects of GHG emissions are cumulative and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA's requirements for cumulative impact analysis. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 recommends consideration of qualitative factors that may be used in the determination of significance, including the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a reduction or mitigation of GHGs. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), a project 's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact can be found not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with an approved plan or mitigation program that provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the geographic area of the project. Examples of such programs include "plans or regulations for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions."

Since this Project is consistent with Greener Glendale Strategies to reduce GHGs and the SCS prepared by SCAG, this project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

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

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

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

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

**H. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

| <b>Would the project:</b>  | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                                   |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project site? |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project site?  |                                       |  |                                     | X                |
| 7. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 8. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |

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

**No Impact.** The project would not involve the use, routine transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. No impact as a result of the project would occur.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rules 403, during construction that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the Project site. Compliance with these rules will result in a less than significant impact.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Verdugo Woodlands Elementary School is located within one-quarter mile of the project site. Hazardous materials are not present on the project site, nor will they be used during construction. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**No Impact.** No private airstrips are located in the City of Glendale or in the vicinity of the Project site. No impact would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, Kirkby Road is not identified as a City Disaster Response Route. North Verdugo Road, located approximately 380 feet from the project site, is a County Disaster Response Route to be used by emergency response services during an emergency and, if the situation warrants, the evacuation of an area. Implementation of the project will not involve any work off-site or in the public right of way. Accordingly, the project would neither result in a reduction of the number of lanes along North Verdugo Road, nor result in the placement of an impediment, such as medians, to the flow of traffic. During construction, the construction contractor will be required to notify the City of Glendale Police and Fire Departments of

construction activities that would impede movement (such as movement of equipment) to allow for these first emergency response teams to reroute traffic to an alternative route, if needed. Further, during construction the applicant would be required to obtain any necessary permits from the City of Glendale Public Works Department for all work occurring within the public right-of-way. Implementation of these requirements would be incorporated as typical condition of approval. Consequently, project impacts on an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would be less than significant.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The project site is located in a High Fire Hazard Area as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element. The Glendale Fire Department rates almost two-thirds of the City as highly susceptible to wildland fires, as the City's High Fire Hazard Area includes all areas with a medium, high or extreme brush fire hazard. California State law requires that fire hazard areas be disclosed in real estate transactions to ensure homeowners are informed of landscaping and structural requirements for fire safety. Additionally, hazard mitigation programs in fire hazard areas currently include fire prevention, vegetation management, legislated construction requirements, and public awareness. In order to minimize damage due to fire, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable fire prevention, vegetation management, and construction requirements. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to wildland fire hazards would be less than significant.

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

**I. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

| <b>Would the project:</b>   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 4. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |
| 5. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?   |                                       |  | X                                   |                  |

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 6. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 7. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 8. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?  |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 9. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 10. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   |                                |   |                              | X         |

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Under Section 402 of the Clean Water Act, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established regulations under the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program to control direct storm water discharges. In the City of Glendale, the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWCQB) administers the NPDES permitting program and is responsible for developing NPDES permitting requirements. The NPDES program regulates industrial pollutant discharges that include construction activities. Implementation of the proposed project will require compliance with all the NPDES requirements including the submittal and certification of plans and details showing both construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) that are integrated into the design of the project. The submittal of a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), as approved by the City Engineer, will also be required to be integrated into the design of the project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project is not expected to violate any water quality standards or waste water discharge requirements since the project will be required to comply with applicable permitting requirements. No significant impacts are anticipated.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The City currently utilizes water from Glendale Water and Power (GWP), which relies on some local groundwater supplies. Implementation of the Project would result in additional development that could indirectly require a slight increased use of groundwater through the provision of potable water by GWP; however, as discussed in Response Q-4 below, the Project’s water demand is within the City’s water projections.

The amount of hardscape proposed on the Project site would only slightly increase the current on-site conditions, so the result would not be a significant impact. The Project would provide a substantial landscape area (40% minimum for the R1R zone) and, therefore, would not significantly interfere with the recharge of local groundwater or deplete the groundwater supplies relative to existing conditions. Consequently, impacts related to groundwater extraction and recharge will be less than significant.

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

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project site is located on a hillside and no watercourses run through it. Currently, water which falls on the Project site either is absorbed into the ground on-site or will run off onto Kirkby Road. The Project will not modify the existing drainage pattern of the site significantly. The method of discharge associated with the area proposed for development will require the approval of the City Engineer. Based on the scale of the Project, the development of a single-family dwelling will not substantially alter the natural drainage of the site, and therefore, would not result in substantial increase in runoff. Less than significant impacts would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response I-3 above.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Responses I-3 above.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response I-1 above.

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

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

**No Impact.** No portion of the Project site is located within a 100-year floodplain, as shown on the latest FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map and in the City's Safety Element (August, 2003). No impact would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located within a 100-year floodplain or other flood hazard area, as shown on the latest FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map, and would not place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows. No impact would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** According to the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element, the Project is not located within the inundation zone of a reservoir or dam located within the City or elsewhere. No impact would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** A review of the County of Los Angeles Flood and Inundation Hazards Map indicates that the Project site is not within the mapped tsunami inundation boundaries. No impact would occur.

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

**J. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

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

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project is to construct a new two-story, 4,114 square-foot single-family dwelling with an attached 648 square-foot, three-car garage. The site is surrounded by other existing single-family residences and is zoned for such use. The established neighborhood would not be divided as a result of the Project. No impact would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** The General Plan and Zoning Code land use designations for the subject site is Low Density Residential. The Project complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan and Zoning Code and will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the Project. The project will require approval from the Design Review Board to ensure less than significant impacts to the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. As a result, no impacts associated with conflicts with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** The Project site and immediate area are not located in an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan area. As such, implementation of the Project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted conservation plan. No impact would occur.



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

**K. MINERAL RESOURCES**

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

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is not within an area that has been identified as containing valuable mineral resources, as indicated in the City’s Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). No impact would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** As indicated in Response K-1 above, there are no known mineral resources within the Project site. No impact would occur.

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

**L. NOISE**

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

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the Project site to excessive noise levels? |                                |   |                              | <b>X</b>  |

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project involves construction of a new single-family residence. This is a permitted use on the subject property, which is zoned R1R. Surrounding land uses include other single-family residences. The development of a single-family residence on this site would not generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. No impact would occur.

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

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

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

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

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

**No Impact.** As indicated in Response L-1 above, significant noise impacts are not anticipated to result from the long-term operation of the proposed project.

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

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

**Less than Significant.** Short-term noise impacts could occur as a result of construction activities. All development within the Project site will be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36), which prohibits construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or from 7:00 p.m. on Saturday to 7:00 a.m. on Monday or from 7:00 p.m. preceding a holiday. Compliance with the City's noise ordinance would ensure that noise impacts will be less than significant.

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

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impact would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would occur.

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

**M. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

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

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

**No Impact.** The project involves the demolition of an existing single-family residence and the construction of a new single-family residence, consistent with adjoining development. The subject site is zoned R1R with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Low Density Residential. The proposed single-family residence is consistent with the permitted uses for this zone and General Plan land use designation and therefore, is not considered growth inducing. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** The project site is currently developed with two residential structures: a single-family residence built circa 1911 that would now be classified as “accessory living quarters”, and the main single-family residence that was built in 1924. No substantial numbers of existing housing will be removed as part of the project since the subject lot is currently developed with a single-family house, and a new single-family residence is proposed. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** Please refer to Response M-2 above. No impact would occur.

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

**N. PUBLIC SERVICES**

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

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

**a) *Fire protection?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the Project site. The project will require compliance with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building permits are submitted for approval. In addition, future residents will be required to comply with GFD brush clearance requirements. Impacts to fire protection are anticipated to be less than significant.

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

**b) *Police protection?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police services to the Project site. Project construction will not result in a net increase in the number of residential units to the area. The site is located in an area of the City developed with single-family uses. The additional population resulting from the proposed project would not have an impact on police services.

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

**c) *Schools?***

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per square foot basis for new residential units or additions to existing units to assist in the construction of or additions to schools. Payment of these fees would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

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

**d) *Parks?***

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

project would not create a significant need for additional parks, given that project involves the replacement of a single-family residence and there is no net increase in the number of residential units. No impacts would occur.

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

**e) Other public facilities?**

**No Impact.** The proposed residence is located in an area of the city intended for single-family uses. The existing public facilities were designed to accommodate such uses. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

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

**O. RECREATION**

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

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

**No Impact.** The project, as proposed, is consistent with the Land Use Element, which designates the Project site as low density residential. The potential demand for new parks, or increased maintenance and additional improvements at existing parks, would be minimal, given that there will be no net increase in the number of residential units. Therefore, no impact associated with the demand of existing park facilities would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing house and associated accessory living quarters, and construction of a new, larger single-family house. No recreational facilities are included in the proposed project. As indicated in Response O-1 above, the project is not anticipated to significantly increase the demand on existing parks, since a single-family residence is considered to be a low intensive land use. No impacts would occur.

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

**P. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 2. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 3. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?  |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 4. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 5. Result in inadequate emergency access?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 6. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?   |                                |   |                              | X         |

- 1) ***Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?***

***Less than Significant Impact.*** The proposed project would not result in a net increase of residences above the current condition since it involves the replacement of an existing single family residence with a new house. However, there would be a temporary increase in day time traffic as a result of the construction activities. A traffic control plan will be required for project construction. The plan will be required to identify all traffic control measures, signs, and delineators to be implemented by the construction contractor. The plan will also be required to identify contractor information, hours of construction, construction worker parking information, as well as the proposed haul route. As a result, no significant impacts are anticipated.

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

- 2) ***Conflict with an applicable congestion management program including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?***

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

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

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

**No Impact.** The Project site is not located near an airport. Consequently, the Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns that would result in safety risks. No impact would occur.

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

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

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

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

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

**Less than Significant impact.** No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Access to the property will be taken from Kirkby Road, which is designated as a local street in the City's Circulation Element. As indicated in Section P-1 above, a traffic control plan will be required for the construction phase of the project. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that emergency access is not impacting during construction. As a result, no significant impacts to emergency access are anticipated.

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

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

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

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

**Q. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and this is: |                                |   |                              |           |
| i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or   |                                |   | X                            |           |
| ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set  |                                |   | X                            |           |

| <b>Would the project:</b>   | <b>Potentially Significant Impact</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than Significant Impact</b> | <b>No Impact</b> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. |                                       |  |                                     |                  |

1) **Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and this is:**

i) **Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or**

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of notice. In addition, no known tribal resource is located on the Project site. In the event that resources are unearthed during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work must be temporarily suspended or redirected until NAHC has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact is anticipated.

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

ii) **A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.**

**Less than Significant Impact.** As mentioned previously, no known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the Project site and surrounding area. Therefore, the potential for impact on known human remains or a resource determined to be significant by a California Native American tribe is low. No resources have been identified on the Project site pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of notice. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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

**R. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**



| <i>Would the project:</i>   | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                            |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 3. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?                                      |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 4. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 5. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 6. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?  |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 7. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?   |                                |   |                              | X         |

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

**No Impact.** Under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) issues National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) permits to regulate waste discharged to “waters of the nation,” which includes reservoirs, lakes, and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of stormwater and construction related discharges. The Project would be required to comply with all NPDES requirements including pre-construction, during construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). In addition, the project will be required to submit an approved SUSMP (Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan) to be integrated into the design of the project. Construction Projects are also required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The Project would comply with the RWQCB-established waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives. Therefore, No impact would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** Although the new residence will be larger than the existing house, the proposed project would not result in a net increase of residential dwelling units. The proposed project is not anticipated to substantially increase the demand for new water or wastewater treatment facilities or the need to expand existing facilities. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**No Impact.** As indicated in Response R-2 above, the project does not involve an increase in the number of residential units. The larger single-family house is not expected to substantially increase the demand for new storm water drainage facilities or the need to expand existing facilities or the construction of new facilities. No impacts would occur.

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

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** Water would be provided to the Project site via existing supply lines adjacent to the project site. The proposed project will be required to comply with the Hillside Landscape Guidelines that include the planting of drought tolerant and California-friendly landscape. In addition, the project will be required to comply with water conservation measures found in the building code. The new residence will be required to meet current water conservation measures that are more efficient than the existing residence. As a result, no significant impacts to the availability of water are anticipated.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Scholl Canyon Landfill has the capacity to accept solid waste until October 2026. Solid waste generation is expected to increase during the demolition and construction phases of the project, as well as when the future residents move into the single-family residence. However, the existing solid waste system would be sufficient to accommodate waste generated by the project. No significant impacts to solid waste facilities are anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

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

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

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

statutes, including Glendale Municipal Code Chapter 8.58. No impacts would occur as a result of the Project.

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

**S. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

| <i>Would the project:</i>  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? |                                |   | X                            |           |
| 2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?   |                                |   |                              | X         |
| 3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  |                                |   | X                            |           |

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

**Less Than Significant Impact.** No impacts are anticipated to occur to the quality of the environment, fish or wildlife habitats, fish or wildlife populations, plant or animal communities, or to rare, threatened or endangered plant and animal species as a result of the proposed project. As discussed in response provided under Section E-1, no impacts to a cultural resource would occur. Potential impacts associated with existing Oak trees have been mitigated to less than significant levels.

- 2) ***Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?***

**No Impact.** Development of the proposed project will not substantially increase traffic nor would it result in a substantial increase in population, as this is a single-family residential development that is replacing an existing single-family house. The proposed project is consistent with the zoning code and General Plan. No impacts would occur

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

**Less than Significant Impact.** The project involves the construction of a new single-family residence to replace an existing single-family house. Development of the proposed project would not create direct and

indirect adverse effects on humans. Many of the less than significant impacts that were identified are considered short-time effects and no significant impacts are anticipated.

### 13. Earlier Analyses

None.

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

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

1. Environmental Information Form application and materials submitted on June 6, 2017.
2. "Historic Resource Assessment: 1829 Kirkby Road", prepared by Arroyo Resources, dated May 31, 2017.
3. "Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Single-Family Residence, 1829 Kirkby Road", prepared by Advanced Geotechniques, dated November 16, 2016.
4. "Indigenous Tree Report for Property at 1829 Kirkby Road", prepared by Arsen Margossian, Consulting Arborist with Bardez Landscape Services, Inc., dated November 24, 2017.
5. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Open Space and Conservation Element," January 1993.
6. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Safety Element, August 2003.
7. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
8. "Guidelines for the City of Glendale for the implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended," August 19, 2003, City of Glendale Planning Division.
9. Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Section 15000 et seq.
10. "CEQA Air Quality Handbook," April, 1993, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
11. "CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook," updated October 2003, South Coast Air Quality Management District.
12. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Noise Element, May 2007.
13. The City of Glendale's General Plan, Recreation Element, April 1996
14. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) Report