

AGENDA ITEM: 4.

DATE: 07-18-11

STAFF REPORT

TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 69124

DATE: July 18, 2011

TO: Lancaster Planning Commission

FROM: Planning Department

APPLICANT: Dionisio Fiorella

LOCATION: 5.08± gross acres located on the south side of Avenue L-10, approximately 290 feet west of 35th Street West

REQUEST: A subdivision of two parcels into four lots and the construction and occupancy of two single family dwellings in addition to the two existing single family dwellings in the SRR Zone

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt Resolution No. 11-10 approving Tentative Tract Map No. 69124.

BACKGROUND: There have been no prior hearings before either the City Council or the Planning Commission concerning this property.

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION, EXISTING ZONING, AND LAND USE: The subject property is designated as NU (Non-Urban Residential; 0.4 to 2 dwellings units per acre) by the General Plan, is zoned SRR (Semi-Rural Residential; one single family dwelling unit per minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet), and the existing two parcels have a single family dwelling on each parcel. The General Plan designation, zoning, and land use of the surrounding properties are as follows:

	<u>GENERAL PLAN</u>	<u>ZONING</u>	<u>LAND USE</u>
NORTH	NU	SRR	Vacant
EAST	NU	SRR	Vacant
SOUTH	NU	SRR	Vacant
WEST	NU	SRR	Vacant

PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS: The site is bounded to the north by future Avenue L-10, to the south by future Avenue L-12, both are dirt roads. All public utilities are available or can be extended to serve the site.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW: Review of pertinent environmental documents has disclosed no significant adverse impact resulting from the proposed subdivision after mitigation measures have been applied. Potential effects are discussed more fully in the attached Initial Study. The Initial Study prepared for the proposed project was sent to the State Clearinghouse SCH #2011051064 for public review. This 30-day public review period ended on June 21, 2011. Based on this information, staff has determined that a Mitigated Negative Declaration is warranted. Notice of intent to prepare a Mitigated Negative Declaration has been legally advertised.

Effective January 1, 1991, applicants whose projects have the potential to result in the loss of fish, wildlife, or habitat through urbanization and/or land use conversion are required to pay filing fees as set forth under Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code. Pursuant to Section 21089(b) of the Public Resources Code, the approval of a project is not valid, and no development right is vested, until such fees are paid.

LEGAL NOTICE: Notice of Public Hearing was mailed to all property owners within a 1,500-foot radius of the project, posted in three places, posted on the subject property, and noticed in the newspaper of general circulation per prescribed procedure.

ANALYSIS: The project consists of a subdivision for four (4) single family lots ranging in size from 50,587 square feet to 50,630 square feet in the SRR Zone. The project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of Non-Urban Residential (Non-Urban Residential; 0.4 to 2 dwelling units per acre) and the SRR zoning designation of the property (Semi Rural Residential; one single family dwelling unit per minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet). Division of the property would allow for the construction of a single family residence on each lot. The proposed project site contains two (2) single family dwellings and the surrounding parcels are vacant.

The proposed residential subdivision would have access from Avenue L-10 via 35th Street West, and from Avenue L-12 via 35th Street West. The City's Subdivision Ordinance Section 16.20.080 establishes standards that are intended to retain the rural character of the area. All interior streets must meet the rural street standards. The proposed subdivision has the potential to generate an additional 20 vehicular trips per day, with 8 trips occurring during peak hours, which would not significantly impact surrounding streets.

The density of the development is consistent with the General Plan designation of Non-Urban Residential (0.4 to 2 dwelling units per acre); the proposed subdivision meets the City's zoning requirements for the SRR Zone; and sufficient access, utilities, and infrastructure exist or can be extended to serve the project site. Therefore, staff is recommending that the Commission approve Tentative Tract Map No. 69124.

Respectfully submitted,

Elma Watson, Assistant Planner

cc Applicant
Engineer

RESOLUTION NO. 11-10

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 69124

WHEREAS, a tentative subdivision map has been filed by Dionisio Fiorella for the division of 5.08± gross acres located on the south side of Avenue L-10, approximately 290 feet west of 35th Street West, into 4 single family lots, as shown on the attached site map; and

WHEREAS, staff has conducted necessary investigations to assure the proposed division of land would be consistent with the purposes of the City's Subdivision Ordinance, the State Subdivision Map Act, and the regulations of the SRR Zone; and

WHEREAS, a written report was prepared by staff which included a recommendation for approval of this tentative map subject to conditions; and

WHEREAS, public notice was provided as required by law and a public hearing was held on July 18, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the initial study was performed for this project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds that the Initial Study determined that the proposed subdivision could have a significant effect on the environment; however, there will not be a significant effect in this case with the implementation of mitigation measures as detailed in Exhibit "A," and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby finds, pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the Public Resources Code, that the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project reflects the independent judgment of the City of Lancaster; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby certifies that it has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed division of land in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and the State Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act prior to taking action; and

WHEREAS, this Commission hereby adopts the following findings in support of approval of this map:

1. The proposed design and improvement of the 4-lot subdivision is consistent with the General Plan land use designation of NU (Non-Urban Residential) for the subject property.
2. The site is physically suitable for the type and proposed density of development because adequate roadway capacity and infrastructure exist or can be provided, and the site has no topographical constraints.

3. The design and improvement of the subdivision are not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and avoidably injure fish or wildlife or their habitat because the site is not within a sensitive habitat area and all potential impacts are reduce to a level of less than significance with mitigation as noted in the environmental review section of the staff report.
4. The design and improvement of the subdivision are not likely to cause serious public health problems because adequate sewer and water systems will be provided to the project.
5. The design and improvement of the subdivision will not conflict with easements acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision because all such easements have been incorporated into the proposed public streets (or will be abandoned), based on staff review of a preliminary title report.
6. The proposed subdivision may have a beneficial effect on the housing needs of the region because an additional two (2) dwelling units could be provided, and the City has balanced these needs against the public service needs of its residents and available fiscal and environmental resources.
7. The proposed subdivision provides, to the extent feasible, for the future passive or natural heating or cooling opportunities in the subdivision because the size and configuration of the parcels would allow for such systems; and

WHEREAS, this Commission, after considering all evidence presented, further finds that approval of the proposed tentative subdivision map will promote the orderly growth and development of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. This Commission hereby approves the mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for this project with the findings that proposed subdivision will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. This Commission adopts the Mitigation Monitoring Program, Exhibit "A".
3. This Commission hereby approves Tentative Tract Map No. 69124, subject to the conditions attached hereto and incorporated herein.

PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED this 18th day of July, 2011, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

JAMES D. VOSE, Chairman
Lancaster Planning Commission

ATTEST:

BRIAN S. LUDICKE, Planning Director
City of Lancaster

**ATTACHMENT TO PC RESOLUTION NO. 11-10
TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 69124
CONDITIONS LIST
July 18, 2011**

GENERAL/ADVISORY

1. All standard conditions as set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 10-25 shall apply except Condition Nos. 21, 65, 67, 68 and 76.

STREETS

2. Per direction of the Public Works Director, improve and offer for dedication the following streets to rural street standards:
 - Avenue L-10 at 44 feet of an ultimate 54-foot right-of-way (improved with 30 feet of pavement, a 2-foot-wide rolled curb on each side of the street, and a 10-foot-wide parkway)
 - Avenue L-12 at 44 feet of an ultimate 54-foot right-of-way (improved with 30 feet of pavement, a 2-foot-wide rolled curb on each side of the street, and a 10-foot-wide parkway)

LANDSCAPING

3. Per the direction of the Planning Director, landscaping and irrigation system shall be installed on all portions of single family residential lots open to view from a public street not used for building, vehicle access, or parking and to be maintained by the homeowner.

OTHER CONDITIONS

4. The applicant shall vary setbacks of house placement and meet all requirements of the Architectural Design Guidelines.
5. Contact Quartz Hill Water District to determine if there are additional off-site improvements or conditions which would be required. The proposed development will also be required to pay all applicable District fees.
6. Use of on-site septic systems is subject to approval of the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (LRWQCB). Should the LRWQCB not approve the use of on-site septic systems, the project shall be required to connect to sanitary sewer.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

7. Based on the Biological Resource Report for the proposed subdivision and per the direction of the Planning Director, a burrowing owl survey shall be made by a qualified biologist within thirty (30) days prior to ground disturbing activities. If burrowing owls or signs thereof are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management measures for this species. Evidence that such re-examination has occurred shall be submitted to the Planning Department.

8. Based on the Biological Resource Report for the proposed subdivision and per the direction of the Planning Director, a nesting bird survey shall be made by a qualified biologist within 30 days prior to construction/ground disturbing activities. If nesting birds or signs thereof are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management measures for the species. Evidence that such re-examination has occurred shall be submitted to the Planning Department.

Mit. / Cond. No.	Mitigation Measure/ Conditions of Approval	Monitoring Milestone (Frequency)	Method of Verification	Party Responsible for Monitoring	VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE		
					Initials	Date	Remarks
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES							
1	A burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If burrowing owls or sign thereof are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species.	Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction, the City must receive a burrowing owl survey advising the site is free of burrowing owls.	Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit, or any ground disturbing activities.	Planning Department responsible for reviewing report.			
2	A nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If nesting birds are encountered, all work in the area shall cease until either the young birds have fledged or the appropriate permits are obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game.	Prior to vegetation removal, grubbing, grading, stockpiling, or construction the City must receive a report from a biologist advising site free from nesting birds.	Prior to final approval of grading plan, issuance of a stockpile permit or any ground disturbing activities.	Planning Department responsible for reviewing report.			

CITY OF LANCASTER
INITIAL STUDY

1. Project title and File Number: Tentative Tract Map No. 69124
2. Lead agency name and address: City of Lancaster
Planning Department
44933 Fern Avenue
Lancaster, California 93534
3. Contact person and phone number: Elma Watson
(661) 723-6100
4. Applicant name and address: Dionisio Fiorella
42153 Lupin Way
Lancaster, CA 93536
5. Location: 5.08± gross acres located south of Avenue L-10 and approximately 290 feet west of 35th Street West
6. General Plan designation: NU (Non-Urban Residential, 0.4 to 2 dwelling units per acre)
7. Zoning: SRR (Semi-Rural Residential, one single family dwelling unit per 20,000 square foot lot)
8. Description of project: A subdivision of two parcels into four lots, and the construction and occupancy of two single family dwellings in addition to the two existing single family dwellings in the SRR Zone
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The subject property consists of two existing parcels with a single family dwelling on each parcels. The site is not bounded by improved streets, but by dirt roads. The proposed residential subdivision would have two points of access: one from Avenue L-10 via 35th Street West and the second from Avenue L-12 via 35th Street West. The surrounding properties are designated NU, zoned SRR and are vacant.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g. permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Approvals from other public agencies for the proposed project include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Southern California Edison (street lights)
- Los Angeles County Fire Department (fire access and life safety equipment)
- Quartz Hill Water District (annexation/connection to the water system)

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

DETERMINATION - On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared:
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because 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 a earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicant 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.

 Elma Watson, Assistant Planner
 Rev. 2
 3/18/10

 Date

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 projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including 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) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” 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 (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). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated”, describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <u>AESTHETICS</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	
II. <u>AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES</u> : In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526)?				X
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
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?				X
III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> -- 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:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
<u>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
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?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
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?				X
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?			X	
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for disposal of waste water?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. <u>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	
VIII. <u>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably fore-seeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?			X	
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
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?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
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?			X	
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?			X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?			X	
f) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
X. <u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u> -- Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?				X
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
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?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X
XII NOISE -- Would the project result in:				
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?			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
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?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:				
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)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
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:				
Fire protection?			X	
Police protection?			X	
Schools?			X	
Parks?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Other public facilities?			X	
XV. RECREATION --				
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?			X	
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?			X	
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X	
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?				X
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?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X	
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?			X	
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?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X	
e) Have a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	
XVII. <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u> --				
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?		X		
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)?			X	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

I. a. Views of scenic vistas are currently available from the roadways and area surrounding the project site as listed by the General Plan (LMEA Figure 12-1). The scenic vistas include views of Quartz Hill (Scenic Area 3). Additionally, views of the mountains surrounding the Antelope Valley are available from the project site. The proposed project would involve the construction and occupancy of two single-family residences in addition to the two existing single-family dwellings located on the project site. With implementation of the proposed project, the available views would not change and

would continue to be available from the public streets. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would occur as a result of the proposed project.

b. The proposed project consists of approximately 5.08 acres of Joshua tree woodland and desert shrub plant community. There are currently two single family dwellings located on the project site. Additionally, the project site is not located along a State Scenic Highway. Therefore, the removal of any scenic resources from the project site would not be a significant aesthetic impact and impacts would be less than significant.

c. Development of the site as proposed would change the visual character of the site in that it would result in the development of two additional single family residences. The proposed project is in conformance with the City's General Plan and zoning requirements for the area. Therefore, it has been determined that impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

d. Currently, there is minimal lighting generated by the project site. Light is generated by vehicles on the surrounding streets and the nearby elementary school. Light and glare would be generated from the project in the form of rural street lights, residential lighting, and motor vehicles. Additionally, the proposed project would not introduce substantial amount of glare as the development would be constructed primarily from non-reflective materials. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

II. a-b. There is no evidence that the site has been previously used for agricultural production. The site is not identified as Prime or Unique Farmland, contains no Williamson Act Contract, and is not located in the proximity to any existing agricultural operation. Therefore, the project would not have an impact on agricultural resources.

c-d. According to the City of Lancaster's General Plan, there are no forests or timberlands located within the City of Lancaster. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the rezoning of forest or timberland and would not cause the loss of forest land or the conversion of forest land to non-forest land. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e. The project site is not currently utilized for agricultural production and contains no forests or timberland. The proposed project would not result in other changes to the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or the conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

III. a. Development proposed under the City's General Plan would not create air emissions that exceed the Air Quality Management Plan (GPEIR p. 5.5-4). The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code. Therefore, the project itself would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Air Quality Management Plan and no impacts would occur.

b. Construction of the proposed project would generate emissions associated with grading, use of heavy equipment, construction worker vehicles, etc. However, these are not anticipated to exceed the construction emission thresholds established by the local air district due to the small scale of the project. Therefore, construction emissions would be less than significant. The project would generate approximately 20 new vehicle trips per day according to the Institute of Transportation Engineers' (ITE) manual Trip Generation, 8th Edition. These trips would generate air emissions; however due to its small size, these emissions would not be sufficient to create or significantly contribute towards violations of

the air quality standards. Therefore, emissions associated with the occupancy of the proposed development would be less than significant.

c. The project would, in conjunction with other development as allowed by the General Plan, result in a cumulative net increase of pollutants. However, since emissions associated with the proposed project are less than significant due to small scale of the project, its contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Impacts would be less than significant.

d. The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is Valley View Elementary School, which is located approximately 390 feet northeast of the subject property on 35th Street West. Based upon the amount of traffic expected to be generated by the proposed project, no significant traffic impacts would be anticipated. Therefore, substantial pollutant concentrations would not occur and impacts would be less than significant.

e. Construction and occupancy of the proposed residential development is not anticipated to produce significant objectionable odors. Construction equipment may generate some odors, but these odors would be similar to those produced by vehicles traveling on 35th Street West. Most objectionable odors are typically associated with industrial projects involving the use of chemicals, solvents, petroleum products and other strong smelling elements used in manufacturing processes, as well as sewage treatment facilities and landfills. These types of uses are not part of the proposed project. Odors may also be generated by typical residential activities (e.g., cooking). However, these odors are considered to be less than significant.

IV. a. A biological resources survey was conducted for the proposed project by Mark Hagan, and documented in a report entitled "Biological Resource Assessment of APNs 3109-002-108, 109, 110, 111", dated March 6, 2007. The survey of the project site was conducted on March 4, 2007. The majority of the site is characteristic of a highly disturbed Joshua tree woodland. Eight Joshua trees were observed within the study area. Except for the Joshua trees, all vegetation had been recently removed from the site. The results of the survey indicated that no desert tortoises or burrowing owls or their sign were observed during the field survey. The proposed project site is not located within the geographic range of the Mohave ground squirrel. The California Department of Fish and Game concurred in their memo regarding TTM 69124 dated June 18, 2007, that the project site does not support habitat for Mohave ground squirrel or desert tortoise and so no further evaluation for these species is needed. On May 30, 2010, Mark Hagan provided a letter updating the original biological report based on a survey conducted May 29, 2010. Some vegetation was present; however, the site is still highly disturbed with large soil piles. The dominant plant species were red-stemmed filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*) and tansy mustard (*Descurainia sophia*). No burrowing owls or sign were observed during this field survey; however, California ground squirrels have moved into the site and provide potential burrowing owl cover sites. Three inactive bird nests and one potentially active bird nest were observed within the Joshua trees. Therefore, in order to ensure that impacts to biological resources are less than significant the following mitigations measures are required.

1. A burrowing owl survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If burrowing owls or sign thereof are discovered during the survey, the applicant shall contact the California Department of Fish and Game to determine the appropriate mitigation/management requirements for the species.

2. A nesting bird survey shall be conducted within 30 days prior to the start of construction/ground disturbing activities. If nesting birds are encountered, all work in the area shall cease until either the young birds have fledged or the appropriate permits are obtained from the California Department of Fish and Game.

b. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

c. There are no federally protected wetlands on the project site that fall under the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d. The project site is not part of an established migratory wildlife corridor. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e-f. The project site is not located within an area designated under an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. Additionally, there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources which are applicable to this site. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

V. a-d. A Phase I Cultural Resource Survey was conducted for TTM 69124 by RT Factfinders during March 2007 and documented in a report entitled "A Phase I Cultural Resource Investigation for 7.5 Acres Northwest of the Intersection of 35th Street West and West Avenue L-12 Lancaster, Los Angeles County California". A surface reconnaissance survey of the property was conducted on March 3, 2007. No archaeological resources were identified on the project site. Development of the site would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource, site, or geologic feature. No human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, were discovered on the site. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources would occur. However, in the event that cultural resources are encountered during the course of construction activities, all work shall cease until a qualified archaeologist determines the proper disposition of the resource.

VI. a. The site is not identified as being in or in proximity to a fault rupture zone (LMEA Figure 2.5) and the site is not identified as being subject to liquefaction (SSHZ maps). According to the Seismic Hazard Evaluation of the Lancaster East and West Quadrangles, this site may be subjected to intense seismic shaking (LMEA p. 2-16). However, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with the seismic requirements of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) as adopted by the City, which would render any potential impacts to less than significant. The site is generally level and is not subject to landslides (SSHZ Map).

b. The site is rated as having a slight to moderate risk for soil erosion (USDA SCS maps) when cultivated or cleared of vegetation. However, there remains a potential for water and wind erosion during construction. The proposed project would be required, under the provisions of Lancaster Municipal Code (LMC) Chapter 8.16, to adequately wet or seal the soil to prevent wind erosion. Water erosion controls must be provided as part of the project grading plan to be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division. These provisions, which are a part of the project, would ensure impacts from soil erosion are less than significant.

c. The project site is not known to be within an area subject to fissuring, sinkholes (LMEA Figure 2-3) or liquefaction (SSHZ Map). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d. The soil is characterized by a low-shrink-swell potential (Figure 2-3). A soils report on the property within the subdivision shall be submitted to the City by the project developer prior to grading of the property and recommendations of the report shall be incorporated into development of the property. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e. The proposed project is anticipated to use a septic system that would be designed and approved based on an approved geotechnical report prior to receiving building plan approvals. In the event the soils are not suitable for a septic system, the project would be required to connect to the sewer system. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

VII. a-b. The proposed project would involve the construction and occupancy of two single-family residences in addition to the two existing single-family dwellings located on the project site. As discussed in Item III.b, the proposed project would generate air emissions during construction activities, some of which may be greenhouse gases. These emissions are expected to be less than the thresholds established by the AVAQMD due to the small size of the project and would not prevent the State from reaching its greenhouse gas reduction targets. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would be in compliance with the greenhouse gas goals and policies identified in the City of Lancaster's General Plan (pgs. 2-19 to 2-24). Therefore, impacts with respect to conflicts with an agency's plans, policies, or regulations would be less than significant.

VIII. a-b. The proposed project would involve the construction and occupancy of two single-family residences in addition to the two existing single-family dwellings located on the project site. The proposed project would not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. Typical construction materials would be utilized during development of the subdivision. Occupants of the subdivision would typically utilize household cleaners (e.g., cleanser, bleach, etc.), fertilizer, and potentially limited use of common pesticides. These uses would be similar to other residential development in the area. The proposed project is not located along a hazardous waste transportation corridor (LMEA Figure 9.1-4); therefore no impacts are anticipated to occur. The project site is currently vacant and no demolition activities would be required. Development of the proposed project would not expose individuals or the environment to asbestos containing materials or lead-based paint. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c. The project site is located within a quarter mile of an existing school. Specifically, Valley View Elementary School is located at 3310 West Avenue L-8. Paraclete High School is located 1 mile east of the project site at 42145 30th Street West. However, as indicated in Item VIII.a, the proposed project would only utilize minimal amounts of hazardous materials, which are typically found in residential/commercial developments. The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous/acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was prepared for the proposed project by Bruin GSI. The findings of the study are documented in a report entitled "Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Assessor Parcel Numbers 3109-002-108/110/111, 35th Street West Near Avenue L-12, Lancaster, California, Bruin Job Number 07-15" and dated February 20, 2007. As part of the

environmental site assessment, a site visit was conducted on February 15, 2007. The property was currently undergoing development of two single family residences. High voltage electrical transformers were not found on the property. No hazardous materials were being stored on the project site and no vent pipes, stained soil or odors were observed. On May 11, 2007, Bruin GSI provided a letter entitled "Revisitation to Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Assessor Parcel Numbers 3109-002-108/110/111/109, 35th Street West near Avenue L-12, Lancaster, California 9353, Bruin Job Number 07-15". The original report did not include APN 3109-002-109; however, research was performed on this parcel, along with the other parcels in February 2007. The conclusions are the same, no changes or deletions are needed for the report.

In addition to the site visit, a regulatory database search was conducted for the project site and the immediately surrounding area (up to one mile radius) by Environmental Data Resources, Inc (EDR). Neither the project site nor the adjoining properties were identified in any regulatory database. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated to occur.

e-f. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport, or private airstrip. The closest airports are United States Air Force Plant 42 which is located more than five miles east of the project site and General William Fox Airfield, which is located more than six miles north of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working the project area and no impacts would occur.

g. The project site is located west of 35th Street West and south of Avenue L-8, which have not been identified as an evacuation routes (LMEA Figure 9.1-3). Additionally, the traffic generated by the proposed project is not sufficient to cause impacts at any of the significant intersections in the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not impair or physically block any identified evacuation routes and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan. No impacts are anticipated.

h. The site could be subject to localized brush fires. However, the site is within the urban service range of Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 84, located at 5030 West Avenue L-12, and Los Angeles County Fire Station No. 134, located at 43225 25th Street West, either of which would be able to provide rapid response in the event of a fire. Impacts are, therefore, less than significant.

IX. a. The proposed project would involve the construction and occupancy of two single-family residences in addition to the two existing single-family dwellings located on the project site. As such, the proposed project would not generate wastewater which would violate water quality standards or exceed waste discharge requirements.

Additionally, the project site is not in area with an open body of water or watercourse and is not in an aquifer recharge area (LMEA p. 10.1-5 to 7). There would be no discharge into a water body or the aquifer as a result of surface runoff from the project. Additionally, the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program, including Best Management Practices. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b. The proposed project would not include any groundwater wells or pumping activities. All water supplied to the proposed project would be obtained from the Quartz Hill Water District which has indicated that it can serve the project site (see letter in the case file) once the project has been annexed into the district. Additionally, as indicated in IX.a., the proposed project would not impact any

groundwater recharge areas. Therefore, the proposed project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge and impacts would be less than significant.

c-e. Development of the site would increase the amount of surface runoff as a result of impervious surfaces from the houses and roadways being constructed. The project would be designed, on the basis of a hydrology study, to accept current flows entering the property and to handle the additional incremental runoff from the developed site. Therefore, impacts from drainage and runoff would be less than significant.

f-g. The project site is not within the 100- year floodplain. However, the project site is located in a 500-year floodplain (FIRM). Therefore, no flooding impacts would occur as a result of placing housing on the project site.

h. The project site does not contain and is not downstream from a dam or levee. Therefore, no impacts would occur from flooding as a result of the failure of a dam/levee.

i. The project site is not located within a coastal zone. Therefore, tsunamis are not a potential hazard. The project site is relatively flat and does not contain any enclosed bodies of water and is not located in close proximity to any other large bodies of water. Therefore, the proposed project would not be subject to inundation by seiches or mudflows. No impact would occur.

X. a. The proposed project is not of the scale or nature that could physically divide an established community. The proposed project consists of the subdivision of two parcels and the construction and occupancy of two additional single family dwellings in an area that is designated as (Non-Urban Residential, 0.4 to 2 dwelling units per acre) with SRR (Semi-Rural Residential, one single family dwelling unit per 20,000 square foot lot) zoning. The proposed project would not block a public street, trail, or other access route or result in a physical barrier that would divide the community. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

b. The proposed project is consistent with the City's General Plan and must be in conformance with the Lancaster Municipal Code. The project will be in compliance with the City-adopted UBC (Item VI.a.) and erosion-control requirements (Item VI.b.). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

c. As noted under Item IV.e-f., the project site is not subject to a habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XI. a-b. The project site does not contain any current mining or recovery operations for mineral resources and no such activities have occurred on the project site in the past. According to the LMEA (p. 2-8 and Figure 2-4), the project site is designated as Mineral Reserve Zone 3 (contains potential but presently unproven resources). Therefore, no impacts to mineral resources would occur.

XII. a. The City's General Plan (Table III-1) establishes an outdoor maximum CNEL of 65 dBA for residential uses. The current noise level on Avenue L-8 between 40th Street West to 35th Street West is estimated to be 60.8 dBA (LMEA Table 8-11). While this noise level is consistent with the standards of the General Plan, the distance from Avenue L-8 and the additional features of the proposed project (e.g., landscaping, block walls, etc.) would ensure that the project remains in compliance with the General Plan. Therefore, potential noise impacts associated with traffic from the proposed development and operational activities would be less than significant.

b. The proposed project consists of the subdivision of two parcels and the construction of two additional single family dwellings. It is not anticipated that construction of the proposed project would require the use of machinery that generates ground-borne vibration as no major subsurface construction (e.g., parking garage) is planned. No ground mounted industrial-type equipment that generates ground vibration would be utilized during occupancy of the proposed residences. Therefore, no impacts associated with ground-borne vibration/noise are anticipated.

c. Permanent increases in area levels would occur once the residential project is completed and occupied. These noise levels would be generated by normal activities that occur in a residential setting (yard work, radio, television sets, etc.) and from motor vehicles (see discussion under XII.a.). Although the traffic generated by the project would contribute to an increase in noise levels in the area, the project's contribution would be minimal because the current and future projected noise levels would remain essentially unchanged with or without the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d. There would be a temporary increase in noise levels in the area during construction of the project. This noise would be generated by construction vehicles and equipment. Construction activities of the project are regulated by Section 8.24.040 of the Lancaster Municipal Code, which limits the hours of construction work to between sunrise and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. Effects are not considered significant because they are temporary and construction times are limited to daylight hours.

e-f. The site is not in proximity to an airport or a frequent overflight area and would not experience noise from these sources (also see Item VIII.e-f). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XIII. a. The project would generate additional population growth in the immediate area because two new dwelling units would be constructed. This additional increase would contribute, on an incremental basis, to a cumulative increase in the population of the City. The project site is within the urban core of the City and within the service area of both the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and Stations 84 and 134 of the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Therefore, the project would not result in a need for additional facilities to provide these services and impacts from increased population growth would be less than significant.

b-c. The project site contains two single family dwellings which would remain with implementation of the proposed project. No housing or people would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, no impacts would occur

XIV. The project would incrementally increase the need for fire and police services; however, the site is within the current service area of both these agencies and the additional time and cost to service the site is minimal. The project would not induce substantial population growth (see Item XIII) and, therefore, would not substantially increase demand on parks or other public facilities.

Development of the project would result in an incremental increase in population (see item XIII), which would result in an increase in the number of students in both the Antelope Valley Union High School District and the Westside Union School District. Proposition 1A, which governs the way in which school funding is carried out, predetermines by statute that payment of developer fees are adequate mitigation for school impacts. Therefore, the Initial Study determines by statute that the fees required of the developer would reduce any identified impacts to a level of insignificance.

XV. a-b. The proposed project would generate additional population growth and would contribute on an incremental basis to the use of the existing park and recreational facilities. However, the applicant would be required to pay park fees which would reduce potential impacts on park and recreational facilities to a level of insignificance.

XVI. a. The proposed project could generate approximately 20 daily vehicle trips based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 8th Edition. It is not anticipated that the project traffic would adversely affect traffic flow on any of the adjoining public streets, and the improvements to be provided as part of the project would ensure necessary, adequate circulation and safety levels for both project-related traffic and long-term cumulative increases. These improvements are identified as conditions of project approval and implementation of these improvements would ensure that impacts are less than significant.

b. There are no county congestion management agency designated roads or highways in the vicinity of the project. No impacts would occur.

c. The project site does not contain any aviation related uses, and the proposed project would not include the development of any aviation related uses. Thus, the proposed project would not have an impact on air traffic patterns.

d. West Avenue L-10 and West Avenue L-12 would be improved to City standards adjacent to the site as part of the project. No hazardous conditions would be created by these improvements. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

e. The project would have adequate emergency access from 35th Street West via Avenue L-10 and Avenue L-12. Interior circulation would be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Los Angeles County Fire Department; therefore, no impacts would occur.

f. The proposed project does not conflict with or impede any of the General Plan policies or specific actions related to alternative modes of transportation (Lancaster General Plan pgs. 5-18 to 5-24). Therefore, no impacts would occur.

XVII. a.-b. The proposed project would discharge its wastewater into a septic system. The proposed project would involve the construction and occupancy of two single-family residences in addition to the two existing single-family dwellings located on the project site, which would generate minimal wastewater. The proposed project would comply with all rules and regulations with respect to wastewater discharge. As the proposed project is a residential development, it would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements and impacts would be less than significant.

c. See Item IX.c-e.

d. The Quartz Hill Water District has not indicated any problems in supplying water to the proposed project from existing facilities (reference letter in case file) once the project has been annexed into the district. No new construction of water treatment facilities or new or expanded entitlements would be required. Therefore, water impacts would be less than significant.

e. See Item XVII.b.

f-g. The project would generate additional solid waste, which would contribute to an overall cumulative impact on the landfill service the site (GPEIR pgs. 5.9-20 to 21); although this project's

individual contribution is considered minimal. Individual residential units within the project would be required to have trash collection services in accordance with City contracts with waste haulers over the life of the project. These haulers are required to be in compliance with applicable regulations on solid waste transport and disposal, including waste stream reduction mandated under Assembly Bill (AB) 939, which was enacted to reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste generated in California to the maximum extent feasible. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII.a. See Items IV, VII, VIII, IX, XIV, and XVII.

b. The proposed project does not have any impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. See Items III, IX, XII, and XVI.

c. See Items III, VI, VII, VIII, IX, XII, XIII, XIV, and XVII.

List of Referenced Documents and Available Locations*:

BRR1:	Biological Resource Assessment of APNs 3109-002-108, 109, 110, and 111 Lancaster, California, Mark Hagan, March 6, 2007	PD
BRR2:	Letter - Biological Report Update for APNs 3109-002-117, 118, And 126, Lancaster, California, Mark Hagan, May 30, 2010	PD
CRS:	Phase I Cultural Resource Investigation for 7.5 Acres Northwest Of the Intersection of 35 th Street West and West Avenue L-12, Lancaster, Los Angeles County, California, RT Facfinders, Richard H. Norwood, March 2007	PD
ESA1:	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Assessor Parcel Numbers 3109-002-108/110/111, 35 th Street West, near Avenue L-12, Lancaster California, Bruin Geotechnical Services, February 20, 2007	PD
ESA2:	Letter - Revision to Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Assessor Parcel Numbers 3109-002-108/110/111/109, 35 th Street West Near Avenue L-12, Lancaster, California, Bruin Job Number 07-15, Bruin GSI, May 11, 2007	PD
FIRM:	Flood Insurance Rate Map	PW
GPEIR:	Lancaster General Plan Environmental Impact Report	PD
ITE:	Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual, 8 th Edition	PW
LACW:	Quartz Hill Water District Letter (APN 3109-002-110 and 3109-002-111) May 8, 2007	PD
LGP:	Lancaster General Plan	PD
LMC:	Lancaster Municipal Code	PD
LMEA:	Lancaster Master Environmental Assessment	PD
SSHZ:	State Seismic Hazard Zone Maps	PD
USGS:	United States Geological Survey Maps	PD
USDA SCS:	United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Maps	PD

* PD: Planning Department
 PW: Department of Public Works
 Lancaster City Hall
 44933 Fern Avenue
 Lancaster, California 93534