

ATTACHMENT K

**CEQA INITIAL STUDY
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

CDMS 2014-0003 BEALL

APRIL 16, 2015

**MENDOCINO COUNTY
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION (IS/MND):**

DATE: April 16, 2015
CASE NUMBER: CDMS_2014-0003
OWNER/APPLICANT: GARY ALLEN BEALL
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant has requests a Coastal Development Minor Subdivision of a 34.38± acre parcel into two parcels of 5± acres and 29.38± acres.
LOCATION: In the Coastal Zone, 2± miles from the Gualala town center, lying west of Old Stage Road (CR 502) at the northwest corner of its intersection with Pacific Woods Road (CR 523).
Environmental Checklist.
<i>"Significant effect on the environment" means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change, may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15382).</i>
<i>Accompanying this form is a list of discussion statements for <u>all</u> questions, or categories of questions, on the Environmental Checklist. This includes explanations of "no" responses.</i>

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"/>	Agriculture and Forestry 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"/>	Utilities / Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance

1. Aesthetics:

I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project location is not visible from any public vantage points and does not lie within a designated Highly Scenic Area (HSA). This subdivision does not permit additional residences on either proposed parcel—a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) would be required for second residential units, subject to Mendocino County Coastal Zoning Code (MCCZC) Section 20.458.020. While the visual impacts of future residential development would be considered with the review of a Coastal Development Permit, additional exterior lights on existing structures must comply with Mendocino County Coastal Zoning Code lighting regulations.

Section 20.504.035 of the Mendocino County Coastal Zoning Code addresses exterior lighting:

- (A) *Essential criteria for the development of night lighting for any purpose shall take into consideration the impact of light intrusion upon the sparsely developed region of the highly scenic coastal zone.*
 - (1) *No light or light standard shall be erected in a manner that exceeds either the height limit designated in this Division for the zoning district in which the light is located or the height of the closest building on the subject property whichever is the lesser.*
 - (2) *Where possible, all lights, whether installed for security, safety or landscape design purposes, shall be shielded or shall be positioned in a manner that will not shine light or allow light glare to exceed the boundaries of the parcel on which it is placed.*
 - (3) *Security lighting and flood lighting for occasional and/or emergency use shall be permitted in all areas.*
 - (4) *Minor additions to existing night lighting for safety purposes shall be exempt from a coastal development permit.*
 - (5) *No lights shall be installed so that they distract motorists.*

As per **Condition 1**, a note shall appear on the Parcel Map that: “All future external lighting, whether installed for security, safety or landscape design purposes, shall be shielded, downcast or shall be positioned in a manner that will not shine or allow light glare to exceed the boundaries of the parcel on which it is placed.” Approval of this application does not entitle the proposed parcels to additional residential development; therefore, there are no impacts to aesthetic resources beyond the existing state of development. **Condition 1** will ensure that potential future alterations to the existing development will not impact aesthetic resources.

2. Agricultural/Forestry:

<u>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The stated intent of the Rural Residential land use designation and zoning district encourages local small food production (farming) as a permitted use on a smaller scale lending support to small sized parcels. However, given the existing site and surrounding area, agricultural uses are not apparent in the general area. No mitigation is required.

3. Air Quality:

III. AIR QUALITY. 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:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Mendocino County Air Quality Management District reviewed the project and offered no comment. **Condition 2** will require that any grading must comply with Air Quality Management District Regulations.

4. Biological Resources:

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The Mendocino County Coastal Zoning Code requires review of all coastal development applications “to determine whether the project has the potential to impact an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA).” This proposed subdivision is unique in that each resulting parcel will already a single family dwelling unit, and additional residential units would require a Coastal Development Permit. The MCCZC Section 20.496.015(A) lists three circumstances by which a project has the potential to impact an ESHA. This application was reviewed based on these circumstances, and discussed below:

- (1) *The development is proposed to be located on a parcel or proximate to a parcel identified on the land use plan map with a rare and/or endangered species symbol.*

Local Coastal Program Map 31 (Gualala) does not indicate the presence of a rare and/or endangered species or habitat on the subject parcel, nor does the map depict a rare and/or endangered species symbol very near or in direct relationship (proximate) to the subject parcel.

- (2) *The development is proposed to be located within an ESHA, according to an on-site investigation, or documented resource information.*

The California Natural Diversity Database (NDDDB), maintained by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, is often relied upon by Planning Staff for documented resource information. The NDDDB indicated the potential for one rare or threatened species—the Townsend’s big-eared bat. According to *Terrestrial Mammal Species of Special Concern in California* Townsend’s big-eared bats are known to roost in “old, mostly abandoned buildings with darkened, enclosed cave-like attics... [and] on walls or ceilings, often near entrances.” The species has restrictive roost requirements and roost “disturbance or destruction has been primarily responsible for population declines in most areas.” While the proposed subdivision would have no impact on the Townsend’s big-eared bat since no construction or demolition is proposed, to limit any future impact, **Condition 2** is recommended directing the applicant to have a qualified biologist inspect unoccupied buildings for signs of habitation by birds and bats in the event they are to be demolished.

- (1) *The development is proposed to be located within one hundred feet of an environmentally sensitive habitat and/or has potential to negatively impact the long-term maintenance of the habitat, as determined through project review.*

Each of the proposed parcels will contain one existing single family residence and related accessory development. The principally permitted use on the parcels—residential use—is already developed , and future residential development is subject to Coastal Development Permits. This subdivision application, if

approved, will not permit any further development or construction on the parcel within one hundred feet of an ESHA or beyond, and will therefore have no impact on biological resources.

Additionally, Staff received no comments from the Department of Fish and Wildlife regarding this application. While this application will not directly affect biological resources, the potential presence of Townsend's big-eared bat habitat should be protected in the event that any future development (particularly demolition) takes place. **Condition 3** will add protection to the threatened species that would not exist without approval of this application.

5. Cultural Resources:

<u>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

An Archaeological Survey of the area was conducted and described in a report dated July 13, 2014. The survey discovered one potential historically significant resource—a dwelling occupied in the late 1940s. The report discusses this occurrence, and concludes that the structure “does not appear to possess qualities that might qualify it as a historical resource as defined in the California Register of Historical Resources, consistent with CEQA guidelines Section 15064.5(1)(2-3).” While no historically significant resources were identified by the survey, Code Sections 22.12.090 and 22.12.100 (Discovery Clause) would apply in the event that archaeological resources are encountered during any future excavation operations. Although approval of this application does not entitle any future development, **Condition 5** is recommended to increase the protection of cultural resources for any future ground disturbance activity.

6. Geology and Soils:

<u>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Approval of the proposed subdivision would not allow for additional dwelling units on either of the resulting parcels. **Condition 6** and **Condition 7** requires the applicant to adhere to “Best Management Practices” for grading resultant from the project.

7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

<u>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Assembly Bill 32 (AB32), the California Global Warming Solutions Act, 2006 recognized that California is a source of substantial amounts of greenhouse gas (GHGs) emission which poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and the environment of California. AB32 established a state goal of reducing GHG emission to 1990 levels by the year 2020 with further reductions to follow. In order to address global climate change associated with air quality impacts, CEQA statues were amended to require evaluation of GHG emission which includes criteria air pollutants (regional) and toxic air contaminants (local) As a result, Mendocino County Air Quality Management District (MCAQMD) adopted CEQA thresholds of significance for criteria air pollutants and GHGs, and issued updated CEQA guidelines to assist lead agencies in evaluating air quality impacts to determine if a project’s individual emissions would be cumulatively considerable. According to the MCQAMD, these CEQA thresholds of significance are the same as those which have been adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Pursuant to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the threshold for project significance of GHG emissions is 1,100 Metric tons CO₂e (CO₂ equivalent) of operation emission on an annual basis. This project as proposed, creating one additional parcel with the no capacity for additional single family residences, will have no impact and be below the threshold for project significance of 1,100 Metric tons CO₂e.

8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials:

<u>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

All fire issues are discussed under Section 14, Public Services.

9. Hydrology and Water Quality:

<u>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The proposed subdivision would create two parcels where one currently exists. Each new parcel will contain an existing single family residence and related accessory development. Each proposed parcel is currently served by North Gualala Water Company and has existing independent septic systems. There will be no increase in septic discharge or increase in water usage resulting from the approval of this application. With regards to septic and water resources, this application creates no impacts and no mitigation is required.

Similarly, no new structural development will be permitted resulting from the approval of this application and will therefore maintain existing drainage, runoff and floodplain conditions.

The subject site is not served by public sewer. Currently, on-site septic systems serve both proposed parcels. The Department of Environmental Health is requesting that a replacement system be designed for both proposed parcels. North Gualala Water Company currently serves both proposed parcels. No impacts with regards to septic or water access are anticipated. **Conditions 8, 9, 10 and 11** reflect the conditional approval of Environmental Health.

10. Land Use and Planning:

<u>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				
---	--	--	--	--

The property is classified Rural Residential-Planned Development within the Coastal Plan and is also zoned Rural Residential-Planned Development-5 acre minimums (RR-PD-5). There is no conflict with the Coastal Land Use Classification in regards to density or use.

The minimum front, rear and side yard for parcels in the RR-5 zoning district, per Section 20.376 of the Coastal Zoning Code is thirty feet. The submitted tentative map shows a tank, shed, and carport (to the north of the proposed property boundary), and a canvas storage building and shed (to the south of the proposed property boundary) that may not comply with this thirty foot setback. Additionally, the tentative map shows a shed along the northern property boundary of proposed Lot A. As per recommended **Condition 12**, the final parcel map must indicate that all structures adhere to the thirty foot setback minimum from all property lines. Any structure that is within the required yard setback must be relocated or removed.

11. Mineral Resources:

<u>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

This subdivision application has no impact on mineral resources.

12. Noise:

<u>XII. NOISE.</u> Would the project result in:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
--	--	--	--	--

Many subdivision requests in residential districts result in the creation of new parcels with residential development potential. The construction of the potential residential development creates noise impacts. The two proposed parcels resulting from this subdivision application already contain single family residences, and additional residential development would be subject to a Coastal Development Permit. As a result, this application does not permit an increase in the intensity of the existing use, and therefore, no impacts relating to noise are expected and no mitigation is required.

13. Population and Housing:

<u>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Given that there is no entitlement for additional residences associated with this application, there is no impact to the housing supply and no mitigation is required.

14. Public Services:

<u>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is served by CalFire and South Coast Fire Protection District. The increase of one additional parcel without an entitlement for additional single family residences (without a Coastal Development Permit) would not create additional service demands or result in adverse physical impacts associated with delivery of fire, police, parks or other public services. **Condition 13** is recommended to

provide for review and approval by CalFire and the South Coast Fire Protection District of fire safe measures to minimize fire hazards to and from the existing residential development on the site.

15. Recreation:

<u>XV. RECREATION.</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project site is located east of Highway 1 and is not designated as a potential public access trail location on the LUP maps. There is no evidence of prescriptive access on the site. The project would have no impact on public access or recreation.

16. Transportation/Traffic:

<u>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?				
--	--	--	--	--

Both proposed parcels front on Old Stage Road (CR 502) along their eastern boundaries. The two parcels resulting from this subdivision application will each contain a single-family residence, allowing for no future residential development without a Coastal Development Permit. There would be no traffic or access impacts stemming from the approval of this application in excess of existing conditions.

The County Department of Transportation (DOT) reviewed the project with regards to circulation, ingress and egress. While this subdivision would create no increase in traffic or access hazards, DOT offered conditional approval that would improve the safety of the existing accesses. In a letter dated May 23, 2014, DOT approved this subdivision application, subject to conditions outlined by **Condition 14, 15, 16, and 17.**

DOT included a condition requiring all existing private driveway approaches serving the proposed parcels be improved to meet minimum sight distance standards. The applicant has revised the application to propose new means of access for each parcel, and proposes to abandon the old driveway approaches. DOT has reviewed the revised application, and, provided the abandoned driveways are fenced to prevent future access, finds that the new access approaches meet minimum sight distance requirements. **Condition 18** is recommended, requiring the applicant to abandon and fence the existing driveways prior to filing of the Parcel Map.

In addition to providing the existing development with new accesses, the applicant will remove vegetation to obtain sight distance minimums. The applicant submitted a vegetation plan, dated January 2015, indicating the vegetation to be removed. Planning staff finds the proposed vegetation removal fails to meet the definition of Major Vegetation Removal, as defined in Section 20.308.080(C) of the Coastal Zoning Code, and does not require a Coastal Development Permit.

The applicant should be aware that, prior to filing of the Parcel Map, the roadway improvements must be inspected and approved by the Department of Transportation, and is subject to encroachment permitting. Upon completion of the roadway improvements, applicant should request inspection.

The approval of this application, subject to the conditions recommended by DOT, would not negatively impact traffic and would improve access safety beyond existing conditions.

17. Utilities and Service Systems:

<u>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.</u> Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The subject site is not served by public sewer. Currently, on-site septic systems serve both proposed parcels. The Department of Environmental Health is requesting that a replacement system be designed for both proposed parcels. North Gualala Water Company currently serves both proposed parcels. No impacts with regards to septic or water access are anticipated. **Conditions 8, 9, 10, and 11** reflect the conditional approval of Environmental Health.

18. Mandatory Findings of Significance:

<u>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Overall, no significant environmental impacts are anticipated, and any less than significant impacts can be mitigated to a level of no impact. Therefore, a Mitigated Negative Declaration is recommended.

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.

DATE

SCOTT PERKINS
PLANNER I

SMP