

RESOLUTION NO: 07-081

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
APPROVING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
TENTATIVE TRACT 2887 AND PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 06-022
(ESTRELLA ASSOCIATES - WILLHOIT)
APN: 025-391-073

WHEREAS, Tentative Tract 2887 (The Cove) has been filed by Wes Willhoit on behalf of Estrella Associates to subdivide an approximate 4.28-acre site into 56 lots, for the development of 51 single family residential lots and 4 open space lots and one common lot that incorporates the interior private streets and other common areas; and

WHEREAS, the site is located at 700 Experimental Station Road; and

WHEREAS, the project site is located within Sub Area D of the Borkey Area Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, Planned Development 06-022 has been filed in conjunction with this tentative map request to meet Section 21.23B.030 of the Zoning Code, which requires Planning Commission approval of a development plan for base zones which are in the planned development (overlay) district; and

WHEREAS, an Environmental Initial Study was prepared for this project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and although project level mitigation measures were identified within the study (on file in the Community Development Department), the conclusion was such to enable a finding of consistency of the project with the approved Borkey Area Specific Plan for which an Environmental Impact Report were already prepared and certified by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, Section 15182 of the State's Guidelines to Implement the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempts projects from additional environmental review when it can be determined that the subject project(s) is consistent with the adopted Specific Plan of which it is a part; and

WHEREAS, based on General Plan Land Use Designation, the 2003 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, the Borkey Area Specific Plan Environmental Impact Report and

information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this tentative tract map and planned development, the staff report and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the Planning Commission finds no substantial evidence that the project would have a significant impact on the environment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that:

1. That the above Recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.
2. That based on the City's independent judgment, the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby approve a Negative Declaration for Tentative Tract 2887 and Planned Development 06-022, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 11TH day of September, 2007, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Johnson, Flynn, Steinbeck, Withers, Treach, Peterson, Holstine

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

CHAIRMAN MARGARET HOLSTINE

ATTEST:

RON WHISENAND, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

darren\Tract\Tract 2887 Willhoit \neg dec res

**ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF PASO ROBLES
PLANNING DIVISION**

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** Tentative Tract 2887 & Planned Development 06-022
- Concurrent Entitlements:** As described above
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Darren R. Nash, Associate Planner
Phone: (805) 237-3970
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** South corner of River Oaks Drive and Experimental Station
Road, Paso Robles, California
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** **Estrella Associates, Inc.**
- Contact Person:** **Wes Willhoit**
- Phone:** (805) 238-1031
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Residential Multi-family, 12-units per acre (RMF-12)
- 6. ZONING:** R3-PD (Res. Multi-family, 12-units per acre, PD Overlay)
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Request to subdivide the 4.28 acre site into 56 lots for development of 51 single family residential homes along with 4 open space lots and 1 common lot that would include the interior private streets and other common areas. The residential lots would range in size from approximately 1,300 square feet to 3,000 square feet. As part of the project the developer will be requesting that the Planning Commission allow reductions in setbacks of the homes to the property lines.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The subject 4.28 acre site is currently being used as a construction storage yard for the River Oaks Development. The site has been graded and is flat, berming, landscaping and fencing has occurred on the site.

Neighboring Properties:

North: R1 zone existing residential, **South:** vacant R3/RMF-12 property, plans in for condo project.

West: existing single family homes, **East :** vacant R3/RMF-12 property, plans in for condo project.

9. RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

None.

10. PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN THE PREPARATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY:

Darren Nash: Associate Planner.

11. CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR PROJECT:

This environmental initial study analyzes the potential impacts associated with the changing of the property designations from commercial to multi-family residential.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

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” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy & Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

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

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. **A 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 significant effect(s) on the environment, but one or more effects (1) have been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) have been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or is “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effect(s) that remain to be addressed.

Signature

Darren R. Nash

Printed Name

Date

Associate Planner

Title

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Unless Mitigation Incorporated
ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.
4. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVII at the end of the checklist.
6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.
7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix I of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the needs and requirements of the City of Paso Robles.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers’ information, a list of applicable standard conditions identified in the discussions has been provided as an attachment to this document.)

SAMPLE QUESTION:

	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant
	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Unless Mitigation Incorporated
ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

Landslides or Mud flows? (Sources: 1, 6)

Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Paso Robles General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal:

- a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Source: 1,2)

Discussion: The request to subdivide the 4.28 acre site into 51 lots would meet the General Plan density threshold of 12-units per acre. Additionally since the slope of the site is less than 5-percent, based on the 4.28 acres, 51 units would comply with the density allowed by the Zoning Code.

- b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Discussion: There are no other environmental plans currently in place for the property by other agencies.

- c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? (Source: 1,2)

Discussion: The proposed project would meet the General Plan and Zoning density designations of 12-units per acre and would therefore be considered compatible with existing land uses in the vicinity.

- d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible uses)?

Discussion: The site is currently constructed as a construction storage lot and would not be an impact to agricultural resources or operations.

- e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

Discussion: Since the residential project would be consistent with the density allowed for by the existing land use and zoning designations, the project would not have an impact.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

- a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? (Source: Paso Robles General Plan.)

Discussion: Since the residential project would be consistent with the density allowed for by the existing land use and zoning designations, the project would not have an impact.

- b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?

Discussion: Since the residential project would be consistent with the density allowed for by the existing land use and zoning designations, the project would not have an impact.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
- Discussion: There is no existing housing on the site.

III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

- a) Fault rupture?

Discussion: This portion of San Luis Obispo County (generally the Paso Robles area) is located at the far southerly end of the Salinas Valley which also extends up into Monterey County. There are two known fault zones on either side of this valley. The San Marco-Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and runs through the community of Parkfield east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the Uniform Building Code to all new development within the City. Soils reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standardly applied conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant.

- b) Seismic ground shaking?

Discussion: See the response to Section III(a). Based on that response, the potential for exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant.

- c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?

Discussion: The City's General Plan contains public safety policies that would require special attention to projects with potential for liquefaction. Also, see the response to Section III(a). Based on the above discussion, the potential for exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards, including liquefaction is not considered significant.

- d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?

Discussion: The project site is not located in an area identified at risk for seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazards.

- e) Landslides or Mud flows?

Discussion: See discussion for III (f).

- f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?

Discussion: See the discussion in Section III(a). In addition to standard erosion control measures being part of a future development, all grading would be subject to standard conditions of approval ensuring that soils conditions are suitable for the proposed structures and improvements. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated.

- g) Subsidence of the land?

Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (a) and (f) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- h) Expansive soils?

Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (a) and (f) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

- i) Unique geologic or physical features?

Discussion: N/A

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Source: 6,7,9)

Discussion: A standard condition of approval has been added to the project that requires the applicant to submit a complete grading and drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer with the improvement plans. Drainage calculations shall be submitted, with provisions made for on-site detention/ retention if adequate disposal facilities are not available, as determined by the City Engineer.

- b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?

Discussion: See comment for IV.a

- c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity)?

Discussion: N/A

- d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?

Discussion: See Sec. IV a, discussion

- e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement?

Discussion: N/A

- f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?

Discussion: N/A

- g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?

Discussion: N/A

- h) Impacts to groundwater quality?

Discussion: N/A

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? (source: 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: It is not anticipated that the amount of ground water will be any more than typically used for a business park/light-industrial type use.

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 9,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The San Luis Obispo County area is a non-attainment area for the State standards for ozone and suspended particulate matter. The SLO County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) administers a permit system to ensure that stationary sources do not collectively create emissions which would cause local and state standards to be exceeded. To aid in the assessment of project impacts subject to CEQA review, the APCD published the “CEQA Air Quality Handbook” in August, 1995. This handbook establishes screening thresholds for measuring the potential of projects to generate air quality impacts. Generally, any project that generates less than 10lbs./day of emissions would “qualify” for a Negative Declaration determination, and a project that generates between 10 and 24lbs./day of emissions would “qualify” for a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Based on the SLOAPCD Handbook, a 51 unit single family residential project would exceed the 10 lbs/day threshold, but be less than the 25lbs/day threshold. All standard conditions will be applied along with up to 6 of the discretionary measures.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There would not be an exposure to sensitive receptors to pollutants with the approval of this project.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Create objectionable odors? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: A Traffic Impact Study was prepared by Penfield & Smith for the General Plan Amendment and Rezone. The study was based on a conceptual 59-unit project.

Penfield & Smith concluded that “No intersection or roadway traffic impacts are anticipated as a result of the project. All three study intersections currently operate at acceptable levels of service under the existing plus project conditions”.

The Study does not indicate any specific mitigation measures related to traffic impacts. Standard development policies of improving streets to City Standards and paying all necessary impact fees will apply.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? Discussion: The proposed design does not create any unsafe design features.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses? Discussion: Emergency Services has reviewed the proposed project and included standard conditions of approval related to access and fire protection. Beyond standard conditions, there are no mitigation measures necessary.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? Discussion: The project exceeds the zoning code requirements for 2 spaces per house and 1 visitor space for every 5 units. The Planning Commission will need to review with the development project the location of the spaces and the applicants request to have parking spaces in the private streets for the units. In terms of this environmental study, the parking is sufficient for the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? Discussion: N/A.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? Discussion: The project will be required to improve the adjacent public streets (River Oaks and Experimental Station) to City Standards which would include bike lanes. On site there are interior path ways for pedestrian and bicycle paths.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to: plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? Discussion: The sign is currently developed as a outdoor construction storage lot. It has been graded and is surrounded by landscape berming. The development of this site to multi-family residential would not have impacts to biological resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: There are no oak trees located on this site.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no oak trees located on this site.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient manner? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?

Discussion: N/A

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increases in existing noise levels?

Discussion: There will be an increase in noise levels during the construction of the project. Once the project is completed, it is not anticipated that there will be significant noise levels.

- b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

Discussion: N/A

PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

- a) Fire protection?

Discussion: Upon the development of the site, standard conditions will be added by the Fire Marshall addressing fire hydrants, sprinklers and access.

- b) Police Protection?

Discussion: During the development plan process in the future, the police department would have the opportunity to review the project and make comments.

- c) Schools?

Discussion: The project is in the vicinity of schools. Elementary school as well as Cuesta Community College. The project has been sent to the School District, no comments were received by the City.

- d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

Discussion: Street improvements have already been completed for the sites street frontages.

- e) Other governmental services?

Discussion: N/A

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

substantial alterations to the following utilities:

- a) Power or natural gas?

Discussion: Southern California Gas Company provides service to the Paso Robles area. The project is not anticipated to interfere with gas services or create an unmet demand.
- b) Communication systems?

Discussion: The Pacific Bell Company provides service to the Paso Robles and County areas. The project is not anticipated to interfere with phone/communication services.
- c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?

Discussion: N/A
- d) Sewer or septic tanks? (Source: 7)

Discussion: The project will be required to hook up to City sewer and water.
- e) Storm water drainage? (Source: 6)

Discussion: A standard condition of approval will be added to the project at the time of development that would require the applicant to submit a complete grading and drainage plan prepared by a registered civil engineer with the improvement plans. Drainage calculations will need to be submitted, with provisions made for on-site detention/ retention if adequate disposal facilities are not available, as determined by the City Engineer
- f) Solid waste disposal?

Discussion: the type of trash service will be determined by the Paso Robles Waste.
- g) Local or regional water supplies? (source: 3)

Discussion: Since the residential project would be consistent with the density allowed for by the existing land use and zoning designations, the project would not have an impact.

XIII.AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (Source: 1,9)

Discussion: The project is not located on a scenic vista or highway.
- b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (Source: 1,9)

Discussion: None anticipated with this residential development.
- c) Create light or glare? (Source: 1,9)

Discussion: At the time of development, light shielding will be required.

XIV.CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- a) Disturb paleontological resources?

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: Since the project meets the density thresholds of the General Plan and Zoning Code regulations, and since the project has already been graded and developed as a construction storage yard it is not anticipated to have a significant impact.

b) Disturb archaeological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The Paso Robles area has been classified as territory occupied by the Migueleno Salinan and the Obispeno Chumash Native California populations. Past community populations have been evidenced at several sites within the Paso Robles area and unincorporated portions of the surrounding County.

Since the project meets the density thresholds of the General Plan and Zoning Code regulations, and since the project has already been graded and developed as a construction storage yard it is not anticipated to have a significant impact.

c) Affect historical resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: Since the project meets the density thresholds of the General Plan and Zoning Code regulations, and since the project has already been graded and developed as a construction storage yard it is not anticipated to have a significant impact.

d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: Since the project meets the density thresholds of the General Plan and Zoning Code regulations, and since the project has already been graded and developed as a construction storage yard it is not anticipated to have a significant impact.

e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: Since the project meets the density thresholds of the General Plan and Zoning Code regulations, and since the project has already been graded and developed as a construction storage yard it is not anticipated to have a significant impact.

XV.RECREATION. Would the proposal:

a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: Since the residential project would be consistent with the density allowed for by the existing land use and zoning designations, the project would not have an impact. The project has provided three separate outdoor/recreation areas and would meet the amenities required for the R3 zoning district.

b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: See comments above.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

XVI.MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

Discussion: Since the project meets the density thresholds of the General Plan and Zoning Code regulations, and since the project has already been graded and developed as a construction storage yard, the project will not have significant impacts to the quality of the environment or biological resources.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Since the project meets the density thresholds of the General Plan and Zoning Code regulations, and since the project has already been graded and developed as a construction storage yard it is not anticipated to have a significant impact.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Since the project meets the density thresholds of the General Plan and Zoning Code regulations, and since the project has already been graded and developed as a construction storage yard it is not anticipated to have a significant impact.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Since the project meets the density thresholds of the General Plan and Zoning Code regulations, and since the project has already been graded and developed as a construction storage yard it is not anticipated to have a significant impact.

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	Same as above
3	City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update	Same as above
4	1977 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
10	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
11	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
12	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446

Summary of Mitigation Measures

Description of Impact

Air Quality

Mitigation Measure

Per APCD handbook, Condition No. 10 of Tentative Tract
Map Resolution.