Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

Bruce W. McClendon FAICP
Director of Planning

March 10, 2008

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

HEARING ON AMENDMENT TO COUNTY CODE TITLE 22 (PLANNING AND ZONING) TO AMEND THE ALTADENA COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT (FIFTH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT) (3-VOTES)

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD, AFTER THE PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Consider the attached Negative Declaration together with any comments received during the public review process, find on the basis of the whole record before the Board that there is no substantial evidence the project will have a significant effect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board, and adopt the Negative Declaration.

2. Approve the recommendation of the Regional Planning Commission to amend the Altadena Community Standards District (CSD) as reflected in the draft ordinance (Attachment 4) for the unincorporated community of Altadena to establish new development standards and design guidelines for R-2 and R-3 zoned properties to ensure compatibility of new structures with surrounding residential properties.

3. Instruct County Counsel to prepare an ordinance amending the Altadena Community Standards District as recommended by the Regional Planning Commission.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Section 22.44.090 of the Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance provides for the establishment of CSDs "to provide a means for implementing special development standards contained in adopted neighborhood, community, area, specific and local coastal plans within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County, or to provide a means of addressing special problems which are unique to certain geographic areas within the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County."

The unincorporated community of Altadena, set among the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains, is predominantly suburban and single-family in nature with a limited number of properties zoned R-2 (Two Family Residence) and R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence).

Recent multi-story developments on these properties drew attention from nearby residents who felt the structures were incompatible with neighborhood character and obstructed mountain views. Additionally, the lack of landscaping on the sloping properties created drainage problems for adjacent property owners.

The Los Angeles County Zoning Ordinance does not address the land use issues relating to the design of multi-story developments on properties zoned R-2 and R-3 and their compatibility with adjacent single-family homes on properties zoned R-1 (Single Family Residence) that exist in the community of Altadena. To address these issues, the proposed amendment to the Altadena CSD establishes new development standards and design guidelines for R-2 and R-3 zoned properties intended to ensure that future development within these zones is consistent with the community's existing development pattern by addressing the following items: structure height, building articulation, and landscaping.

Los Angeles County General Plan policies encourage guidelines governing scale and design on a community-by-community basis. The Altadena Community Plan includes policies that allow for new development which is compatible with and complements existing uses. The proposed design standards for R-2 and R-3 zoned properties are therefore consistent with the General Plan and Altadena Community Plan.

On February 26, 2008, the Regional Planning Commission considered the Altadena CSD amendment in a public hearing and recommended that it be adopted by the Board.

IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNTYWIDE STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The proposed CSD promotes Goal 1 of the County's Strategic Plan pertaining to "Service Excellence" through the development of clear and reasonable development standards and guidelines demonstrating that the Department of Regional Planning is responsive to citizens' concerns and ready to work with community groups and residents to address such concerns.

FISCAL IMPACT

Implementation of the proposed amendment will not result in any significant new costs to the Department of Regional Planning or other County departments or in any loss of revenue to the County. Adoption of this amendment will not result in the need for additional departmental staffing.

FINANCING

The proposed amendment will not result in additional net County costs and therefore a request for financing is not being made at this time.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The Altadena CSD amendment includes public input received during a community meeting held in Altadena on May 3, 2007. Additionally, staff attended two Altadena Land Use Committee meetings held on November 7, 2006 and January 8, 2008 to receive additional input.

The Regional Planning Commission conducted a public hearing regarding the CSD amendment on February 27, 2008. The Commission heard testimony from one individual in support of the amendment and one testifier requesting clarification on the applicability of the standards to new versus existing structures.

A public hearing is required pursuant to Section 22.16.200 of the County Code and Section 65856 of the Government Code. Required notice must be given pursuant to the procedures and requirements set forth in Section 22.60.174 of the County Code. These procedures exceed the minimum standards of Sections 6061, 65090, and 6586 of the Government Code relating to notice of public hearing.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Approval of the proposed amendments will not significantly impact County services.

NEGATIVE DECLARATION/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The proposed Community Standards District amendment constitutes regulatory actions which will not have a significant effect on the environment. The attached Initial Study shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before your Board, that the adoption of the proposed amendment may have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, in accordance with Section 15070 of the State CEQA guidelines, a Negative Declaration was prepared.

A copy of the proposed Negative Declaration was transmitted to the Altadena Library for public review. In addition, public notice was published in one newspaper of general circulation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092. No comments were received during the public review period.

Based on the attached Negative Declaration, adoption of the proposed Community Standards District amendment will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Respectfully submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

Bruce W. McClendon, FAICP
Director of Planning

BWM:th

Attachments:

1. Project Summary
2. Summary of Regional Planning Commission Proceedings
3. Resolution of the Regional Planning Commission
4. Recommended Ordinance for Board Adoption
5. Environmental Document
6. Legal Notice of Board Hearing
7. List of Persons to be Notified

c: Chief Administrative Officer
County Counsel
Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
Auditor-Controller
Director, Department of Public Works
Assessor

ATTACHMENT 1: PROJECT SUMMARY

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Proposed amendments to Title 22 (Planning and Zoning) to amend the Altadena Community Standards District (CSD) to include development standards and design guidelines for R-2 and R-3 zoned properties to ensure compatibility of new structures with surrounding residential properties.
REQUEST:	Adoption of the proposed amendments to Title 22; Advance Plannning Case No. 200701727.
LOCATION:	Altadena
APPLICANT OR SOURCE:	Regional Planning Commission directive
STAFF CONTACT:	Ms. Thuy Hua at (213) 974-6476
RPC HEARING DATE:	February 27, 2008
RPC RECOMMENDATION:	Board public hearing to consider adoption of the proposed amendment.
MEMBERS VOTING AYE:	Commissioners Helsley, Bellamy, Valadez, Rew, and Modugno
MEMBERS VOTING NAY:	None
KEY ISSUES:	Recent R-2 and R-3 residential developments raised concerns over the impacts of the compatibility of additional new structures on such lots with adjoining properties. The sloping topography of Altadena creates a unique environment in which newly constructed buildings seem taller than they normally would. The compatibility of multi-family structures adjacent to or adjoining single-family lots is addressed through the establishment of R-2 and R-3 development standards and design guidelines.

MAJOR POINTS FOR: The proposed CSD provisions provide community specific development and design standards that will guide future development in R-2 and R-3 zones whereas current Countywide policies do not address the needs of the community.

MAJOR POINTS AGAINST: Some community members felt that the imposition of such standards could potentially restrict property owners from creating architecturally diverse structures.

ATTACHMENT 2: SUMMARY OF REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS

REGIONAL PLANNNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEEDINGS

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO COUNTY CODE TITLE 22 (PLANNING AND ZONING) TO AMEND THE ALTADENA COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT

AMEND THE ALTADENA COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT (CSD) FOR THE UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY OF ALTADENA

February 27, 2008

The Commission conducted a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to Title 22 to amend the Altadena Community Standards District (CSD) for the unincorporated community of Altadena to establish new development standards and design guidelines for R-2 and R-3 zoned properties to ensure compatibility of new structures with surrounding residential properties.

Staff presented a Powerpoint presentation providing graphical depictions of the provisions proposed within the amendment.

The Commission recognized the increasing pressure countywide on mitigating quality of life issues presented when there is a lack of buffering between R-2 (Two Family Residence) or R-3 (Limited Multiple Family Residence) and R-1 (Single Family Residence) zones. Additionally, they acknowledged the unique sloping topographical character of Altadena which gives the appearance of taller structures and thus contributes to the need for such standards.

One member of the public representing the Altadena Town Council spoke in support of the proposed amendment. Another member of the public spoke, requesting clarification on the applicability of the standards to new versus existing structures.

The Commission closed the public hearing and approved the CSD as proposed. Staff was then instructed to transmit the item to the Board of Supervisors for consideration. All five commissioners voted aye.

ATTACHMENT 3: RESOLUTION OF THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS

RESOLUTION
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has reviewed the matter of amendments to Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Los Angeles County code relating to the Altadena Community Standards District (CSD); and

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission finds as follows:

1. The unincorporated community of Altadena is part of the Fifth Supervisorial District. The area is located in the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains, bounded on the north by the Angeles National Forest, and on the east, south, and west by the City of Pasadena.

2. The subject community is predominantly suburban with a range of residential density zones.

3. In June 2006 the Altadena Town Council submitted a letter to the Director of Planning requesting an amendment to the Altadena Community Standards District to include additional design standards for a specified group of properties along Washington Boulevard zoned R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence).

4. In October 2006 Department of Regional Planning staff requested that the Regional Planning Commission initiate an amendment to the Altadena Community Standards District that would address the concerns of the residents, property owners, the Altadena Town Council, and other stakeholders. The Commission initiated an amendment that would apply to all properties zoned R-3.

5. In November 2006 the Altadena Town Council Land Use Committee requested that Department of Regional Planning staff investigate additional design standards for properties zoned R-2. Subsequently the Town Council submitted a letter to the Director of Planning reiterating this request.

6. After studying the issues and conducting community outreach, Department of Regional Planning staff recommends an amendment to the Altadena Community Standards District that would establish design and development standards for properties zoned R-2 and R-3.

7. The proposed Community Standards District amendment is intended to ensure that new residential development conforms to community character, with requirements concerning landscaping, building articulation, and structure

setbacks, while also allowing for the construction of much-needed additional housing.

8. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, an Initial Study was prepared for the project, which demonstrates that this regulatory action will not have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, DRP has prepared a related Negative Declaration for this project.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Regional Planning Commission recommends that the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors:

1. Hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendments to Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Los Angeles County Code relating to the Altadena Community Standards District (RADV T200700010);

2. Certify completion of and approve the attached Negative Declaration and find that the amendment of the Altadena Community Standards District will not have a significant effect on the environment; and

3. Adopt the attached Community Standards District amendment containing modifications to Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance), and determine that it is compatible with, and supportive of the goals and policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan.

I hereby certify that the foregoing was adopted by a majority of the voting members of the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles on February 27, 2008.

By _____

Rosie O. Ruiz, Secretary
Regional Planning Commission
County of Los Angeles

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL

By _____

ATTACHMENT 4: RECOMMENDED ORDINANCE FOR BOARD ADOPTION

ORDINANCE NO. _____

An ordinance amending Title 22 – Planning and Zoning – of the Los Angeles County Code related to the addition of development standards to the Altadena Community Standards District.

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles ordains as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 22.44.127 is hereby amended as follows:

22.44.127 Altadena Community Standards District

...

C. Community-wide Development Standards. Where landscaping is required by this CSD, it shall be maintained with regular pruning, weeding, fertilizing, litter removal, and replacement of plants as necessary. Drought tolerant plants are highly encouraged.

D. Zone-specific Development Standards

...

2. Zone R-2.

a. Height Limits.

i. Where new fill material is to be placed beneath a proposed structure, the height of such structure shall be measured from the previously existing grade.



ii. On a lot or parcel of land 20,000 square feet in size or smaller, the maximum height of any structure shall be 30 feet.

b. Front Yards. At least 50 percent of the required front yard shall be landscaped.

c. Building Design.

i. Rooflines in excess of 30 feet shall be broken into smaller sections by use of decorative elements such as dormers, gables, eyebrows, parapets, mansards, or by other means deemed appropriate by the Director.

ii. The floor area of any story above the first story shall be 20 percent less than the floor area of the first story and shall be set back from the side or rear of the structure. Attached garages and other attached non-living areas shall be included in computing the floor area of the first story.



d. Modification of Development Standards.

i. The director may permit modifications to the development standards specified herein (subsections D.2.a through D.2.b), provided that:

(A) The application of these standards would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships;

(B) There are exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the subject property or to the intended development of the property that do not apply to other properties within the CSD area; and

(C) That granting the requested modification will not be materially detrimental to properties or improvements in the area or contrary to the purpose of this CSD or Altadena Community Plan.

ii. Application. The procedure for filing a request for modification shall be the same as that for a director's review as set forth in Part 12 of Chapter 22.56 except that the applicant shall also submit:

(A) A list, certified by affidavit or statement under penalty of perjury, of the names and addresses of all persons who are shown on the latest available assessment roll of the County of Los Angeles as owners of the subject property, and as owning property within 200 feet from the exterior boundaries of the subject property;

(B) Two sets of gummed mailing labels with the property owners' names and addresses and one photocopy of the labels;

(C) A 500-foot ownership map drawn to a scale of 1" = 100' indicating the location of all such properties and the owners of such properties; and

(D) A filing fee, as set forth in Section 22.60.100, equal to that required for a Site Plan Review for Director's Review for Modification of Development Standards in a Community Standards District.

iii. Notice. Not less than 30 calendar days prior to the date an action is taken, the director shall send certified notice of the pending application by first-class mail to the Town Council and the property owners identified in subsection d.ii.A. The notice shall indicate that the Town Council and the property owners identified in subsection d.ii.A may submit written protest to the director within 14 calendar days from the date of the notice.

iv. Written Protest. Written protests shall demonstrate how the application fails to satisfactorily meet the burden of proof in subsection d.i and Section 22.56.1690. Such written protests will only be accepted from those properties notified in d.ii.A. Multiple written protests submitted by different owners of the same lot or parcel of land shall be considered one written protest. Similarly, letters from multiple Town Council members will be weighted as one protest.

v. Approval. The director shall approve an application where the application satisfactorily meets the burden of proof in subsection d.i and Section 22.56.1690 and not more than two written protests are received pursuant to subsections d.ii.A and d.iv. If the director approves the application, the director shall send certified notice of the decision by first-class mail to the applicant, the Town Council and the property owners identified in subsection d.ii.A.

vi. Denial. If three or more written protests are received pursuant to subsections d.ii. and d.iv., the pending application shall be denied. If the director denies the application for any reason, the director shall send notice of the decision by certified mail to the applicant, the Town Council, and the property owners identified in subsection d.iiA. The notice shall indicate that the applicant may file an appeal and request a

public hearing before the hearing officer within 14 calendar days following the date on the notice.

vii. Appeal. Appeals by the applicant shall require an additional fee for a public hearing as set forth in Section 22.60.100 under Site Plan Review, Director's Review for Modification of Development Standards in a Community Standards District. All procedures relative to the appeal and public hearing shall be the same as for a conditional use permit.

viii. Hearing Officer Decision. The hearing officer shall approve or deny the application pursuant to the principles and standards of Section 22.56.090. The decision of the hearing officer shall become final and effective on the date of the decision and shall not be subject to further administrative appeal.

3. Zone R-3

a. Height Limits. Where new fill material is to be placed beneath a proposed structure, the height of such structure shall be measured from the previously existing grade.



b. Interior Side Yards.

i. Required interior side yards that are adjoining a single-family or two-family residentially-zoned property in any jurisdiction shall be landscaped, and such

landscaping shall include shrubbery and/or trees to provide shielding from the adjoining property.

ii. Driveways, walkways, patio slabs, and other areas constructed of concrete, asphalt, or similar materials shall not be permitted in required interior side yards that are adjoining a single-family or two-family residentially-zoned property in any jurisdiction.

iii. Uncovered porches, platforms, landings, decks, and balconies may not project into interior side yards that are adjoining a single-family or two-family residentially-zoned property in any jurisdiction.

c. Rear Yards. Rear yards that are adjoining a single-family or two-family residentially-zoned property in any jurisdiction shall include a landscaped area with a minimum depth of 10 feet as measured from the rear property line. Such landscaped area shall include shrubbery and/or trees to provide shielding from the adjoining property. At least one minimum 15-gallon tree shall be provided for every 250 square feet of landscaped area.



d. Building Design. Rooflines in excess of 30 feet shall be broken into smaller sections by use of decorative elements such as dormers, gables, eyebrows, parapets, mansards or by other means deemed appropriate by the Director.



e. Structure Height and Setback. For structures that exceed 25 feet in height and are located on a lot or parcel of land adjoining a single-family or two-family residentially-zoned property in any jurisdiction:

i. At the inside boundary of an interior side yard adjoining a single-family or two-family residentially-zoned property in any jurisdiction, the maximum height of the structure shall be 25 feet and any portion of the structure that exceeds 25 feet in height shall be set back an additional foot for every two feet in height; and



ii. At the inside boundary of a rear yard adjoining a single-family or two-family residentially-zoned property in any jurisdiction, the maximum height of the structure shall be 25 feet and any portion of the structure that exceeds 25 feet in height shall be set back an additional foot for every foot in height.



f. Modification of Development Standards. The director may permit modifications to the development standards specified herein (subsections D.3.a through D.3.e) pursuant to the procedures contained within subsection D.2.d.

...

ATTACHMENT 5: ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING
320 WEST TEMPLE STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: R2007-01727

1. DESCRIPTION: The project consists of a Community Standards District (CSD) zoning ordinance amendment. The objective of the CSD amendment, which would establish additional development standards and design guidelines for R-2 (Two-Family Residence) and R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence) zoned properties within Altadena, is to ensure that future residential developments are compatible with the community's existing development pattern as well as the goals, objectives, and policies of the Altadena Community Plan. Policies specifically address structure height, building stepback, and landscaping. This is not a development project nor does it propose additional development beyond what is currently allowed under the existing Altadena Community Plan and zoning ordinance.

2. LOCATION: Altadena

3. PROPONENT: Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning

4. FINDINGS OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:
BASED ON THE INITIAL STUDY, IT HAS BEEN DETERMINED THAT THE PROJECT WILL NOT HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT.

5. THE LOCATION AND CUSTODIAN OF THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS ON WHICH ADOPTION OF THIS NEGATIVE DECLARATION IS BASED IS: DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING, 320 WEST TEMPLE STREET, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

PREPARED BY: Thuy Hua
Senior Regional Planning Assistant

DATE: 1/23/2008

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: R2007-01727

CASES: RADV T200700010

*** * * * INITIAL STUDY * * * ***

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date:		**Staff Member:**	Thuy Hua
Thomas Guide:	Pages 535, 536, 566	**USGS Quad:**	Pasadena, Mt. Wilson
Location:	The unincorporated community of Altadena is located approximately 16 miles northeast of the Los Angeles Civic Center. It is bounded by the City of Pasadena to the west, south and southeast and by the Angeles National Forest to the northeast and north.		
Description of Project:	The project consists of a Community Standards District (CSD) zoning ordinance amendment. The objective of the CSD amendment, which would establish additional development standards and design guidelines for R-2 (Two-Family Residence) and R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence) zoned properties within Altadena, is to ensure that future residential developments are compatible with the community's existing development pattern as well as the goals, objectives, and policies of the Altadena Community Plan. The development standards and design guidelines contained within the CSD are oriented towards articulating building mass and providing adequate buffering. Policies specifically address structure height, building stepback, and landscaping. This is not a development project nor does it propose additional development beyond what is currently allowed under the existing Altadena Community Plan and zoning ordinance.		
Gross Area:	5,604 acres (8.76 square miles)		
Environmental Setting:	The unincorporated community of Altadena is a suburban community located approximately 1,350 feet above sea level in the foothills of the San Gabriel Mountains.		
Zoning:	Various (A-1, A-1-10000, R-1-7500, R-1-10000, R-1-20000, R-1-40000, R-2, R-3, R-3-P, R-4, C-1, C-3, C-M, M-1, R-R)		
General Plan:	N/A (Altadena Community Plan)		
Community/Area Wide Plan:	Altadena Community Plan, various designations (1-		

	Estate/Equestrian, 2-Low Density, 3-Low/Medium Density, 4-Medium Density, BP-Business Park, CB-Commercial/Business, CR- "Center" Mixed Use, FC-Flood Control Facilities, I-Institutions, NF-National Forest, N-Non-Urban, PR-Public & Private Recreation, TC-Transportation Corridor, U-Utilities, SP-Specific Plan)

Major projects in area:

Project Number	Description	Status
N/A		

NOTE: For EIRs, above projects are not sufficient for cumulative analysis.

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

- ☒ None
- ☐ Regional Water Quality Control Board
  - ☐ Los Angeles Region
  - ☐ Lahontan Region
- ☐ Coastal Commission
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers
- ☐

Trustee Agencies

- ☒ None
- ☐ State Fish and Game
- ☐ State Parks
- ☐
- ☐

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☒ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mtns.
- ☒ City of Pasadena
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Regional Significance

- ☒ None
- ☐ SCAG Criteria
- ☐ Air Quality
- ☐ Water Resources
- ☐ Santa Monica Mtns Area
- ☐ _____

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Fire Department
- ☒ DPW: Traffic & Lightin Geotechnical & Materia Engineering, Drainage ar Grading
- ☐ _____

CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg	Less than Significant Impact/No Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Flood	6	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Fire	7	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Noise	8	☒	☐	☐	
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Air Quality	10	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Biota	11	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Cultural Resources	12	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mineral Resources	13	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	☒	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	☒	☐	☐	
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Education	18	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Utilities	20	☒	☐	☐	
OTHER	1. General	21	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Environmental Safety	22	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Land Use	23	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Pop./Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	☒	☐	☐	
	Mandatory Findings	25	☒	☐	☐	

ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)

DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEM (DMS)

As required by the Los Angeles County General Plan, DMS* shall be employed in the Initial Study phase of the environmental review procedure as prescribed by state law.

1. Development Policy Map Designation: *1-Revitalization, 2-Conservation/Maintenance, 5-Urban Open Space, 9-Non-Urban Open Space*

2. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project located in the Antelope Valley, East San Gabriel Valley, Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains or Santa Clarita Valley planning area?

3. ☐ Yes ☒ No Is the project at urban density and located within, or proposes a plan amendment to, an urban expansion designation?

If both of the above questions are answered "yes", the project is subject to a County DMS analysis.

☐ Check if DMS printout generated (attached)

Date of printout: _____

☐ Check if DMS overview worksheet completed (attached)

*EIRs and/or staff reports shall utilize the most current DMS information available.

Environmental Finding:

FINAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Regional Planning finds that this project qualifies for the following environmental document:

☒ NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was determined that this project will not exceed the established threshold criteria for any environmental/service factor and, as a result, will not have a significant effect on the physical environment.

☐ MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, in as much as the changes required for the project will reduce impacts to insignificant levels (see attached discussion and/or conditions).

An Initial Study was prepared on this project in compliance with the State CEQA Guidelines and the environmental reporting procedures of the County of Los Angeles. It was originally determined that the proposed project may exceed established threshold criteria. The applicant has agreed to modification of the project so that it can now be determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the physical environment. The modification to mitigate this impact(s) is identified on the Project Changes/Conditions Form included as part of this Initial Study.

☐ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT*, inasmuch as there is substantial evidence that the project may have a significant impact due to factors listed above as "significant."

☐ At least one factor has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on the attached sheets (see attached Form DRP/IA 101). The EIR is required to analyze only the factors not previously addressed.

Reviewed by: *Thuy Hua, Senior Regional Planning Assistant* Date: *January 23, 2008*

Approved by: *Mitch Glaser, AICP, Supervising Regional Planner* Date: *January 23, 2008*

*NOTE: Findings for Environmental Impact Reports will be prepared as a separate document following the public hearing on the project.

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? *Vasquez Creek Fault runs through the north and northeast portions of the Altadena Community Planning Area. The Serra Madre Fault connects to the Vasquez Creek Fault in the northwest corner of the Altadena Community Planning Area. (Los Angeles County Safety Element – Fault Rupture Hazards & Seismicity Map)*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? *Northern portions of the community which do not include R-2 or R-3 zoned properties contain major earthquake induced landslide areas. (State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map – Pasadena & Mt. Wilson Quads)*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? *Northern portions of the community which do not include R-2 or R-3 zoned properties are subject to liquefaction. (State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map – Pasadena & Mt. Wilson Quads)*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard? *Proposed project is an amendment to the Altadena CSD regulating height and building design in R-2 and R-3 zones and does not involve sensitive uses.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%? *Grading would not be regulated or required by the proposed amendment.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project 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?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Sections 308B, 309, 310 and 311 and Chapters 29 and 70.

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☒ Approval of Geotechnical Report by DPW

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address potential geotechnical concerns.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **geotechnical** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 2. Flood

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? *Rubio Wash is located in eastern half of the Altadena Community Planning Area in the Mt. Wilson Quad. Arroyo Seco Wash and Eaton Canyon Wash are located adjacent to the outside of the western and eastern, respectively, borders of the Altadena Community Planning Area.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? *After reviewing the Los Angeles County Safety Element – Flood Inundation Hazards Map, it is found that the Altadena Community Planning Area does not contain 100-year or 500-year floodplains.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? *The community of Altadena is heavily urbanized and is not subject to high mudflow conditions.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off? *Grading would not be regulated or required by the amendment nor will it expand the pad areas. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? *The Altadena CSD amendment proposes design provisions that address height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. It is not proposing any development.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)? *N/A*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225 C Section 308A ☒ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☒ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews by the Department of Public Works and require building permits to address potential flood concerns.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **flood (hydrological)** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 3. Fire

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (Fire Zone 4)? *Portions of the community are located in Fire Zone 4 as depicted in the Los Angeles County Safety Element – Wildland & Urban Fire Hazards Map.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, widths, surface materials, turnarounds or grade? The Altadena CSD amendment is applicable to R-2 and R-3 zones. As individual development projects are proposed, they will be reviewed on a project by project basis for adequate access.
c.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? *The Altadena CSD amendment is applicable to R-2 and R-3 zones but dwelling units are not proposed as part of the amendment. As individual development projects are proposed, they will be reviewed on a project by project basis for adequate access.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? *The Altadena CSD amendment is applicable to R-2 and R-3 zones with provisions for height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Properties in these zones must meet Fire Department regulations and will not be adjusted by this amendment.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? *Any future proposed uses located next to flammables would be conditioned appropriately by the Fire Department.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? *The Altadena CSD amendment addresses height, building stepback, and landscaping. The reduced height and stepback could reduce fire hazards.*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☒ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☒ Fire Regulation No. 8

☒ Fuel Modification/Landscape Plan

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address potential fire hazard concerns through implantation of provisions and requirements of the County's Building and Fire Codes.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by **fire hazard** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒Less than significant/No impact

HAZARDS - 4. Noise

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located near a high noise source (airports, railroads, freeways, industry)? *Interstate 210 is adjacent to the southwest portion of project site.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? *The Altadena CSD amendment is applicable to all R-2 and R-3 properties but does not propose any type of development or sensitive use.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project substantially increase ambient noise levels including those associated with special equipment (such as amplified sound systems) or parking areas associated with the project? *The Altadena CSD amendment addresses height, building stepback, landscaping in R-2 and R-3 zones. Such additional restrictions reduce ambient noise levels between adjoining residences.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels without the project? *The Altadena CSD amendment addresses height, building stepback, landscaping in R-2 and R-3 zones. Such additional restrictions reduce ambient noise levels between adjoining residences.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Noise Ordinance No. 11,778 ☒ Building Ordinance No. 2225--Chapter 35

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address noise concerns.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely impacted by **noise**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 1. Water Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having known water quality problems and proposing the use of individual water wells? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. No development is being proposed. Any future development proposals would be subject to comply with permits issued by the Department of Public Works and corresponding water agency. Use of individual water wells is not being proposed.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. No development is being proposed. Any future development proposals would be subject to comply with permits issued by the Department of Public Works.*
	☐	☐	☐	If the answer is yes, is the project site located in an area having known septic tank limitations due to high groundwater or other geotechnical limitations *or* is the project proposing on-site systems located in close proximity to a drainage course?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project's associated construction activities significantly impact the quality of groundwater and/or storm water runoff to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving water bodies? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. Any future development proposals will be subject to comply with NPDES standards.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project's post-development activities potentially degrade the quality of storm water runoff and/or could post-development non-storm water discharges contribute potential pollutants to the storm water conveyance system and/or receiving bodies? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. Any future development proposals will be subject to comply with NPDES standards.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☐ Industrial Waste Permit ☐ Health Code Ordinance No. 7583, Chapter 5

☐ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☒ NPDES Permit Compliance (DPW)

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address water quality concerns.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **water quality** problems?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 2. Air Quality

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project exceed the State's criteria for regional significance (generally (a) 500 dwelling units for residential uses or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for nonresidential uses)? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping. No development is being proposed.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use? *No development is being proposed nor any sensitive uses.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project increase local emissions to a significant extent due to increased traffic congestion or use of a parking structure, or exceed AQMD thresholds of potential significance? *No development is being proposed as part of the Altadena CSD amendment. Any future development proposals will have to meet AQMD thresholds.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building setbacks, and landscaping in R-2 and R-3 zones. Such zones do not authorize such uses that would create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not involve any development that would obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans. It regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping and does not affect the applicability of an air quality plan.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not involve any development. It is a policy document that regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping and does not violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project 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)?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors: *N/A*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address air quality concerns.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be impacted by, **air quality**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 3. Biota

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural? *Community does not contain SEAs as depicted in the 1980 Los Angeles County General Plan.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not involve grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements. The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development.*
c.	☐	☐	☒	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site? *Rubio Wash is located in eastern half of the Altadena Community Planning Area in the Mt. Wilson Quad. Arroyo Seco Wash and Eaton Canyon Wash are located adjacent to the outside of the western and eastern, respectively, borders of the Altadena Community Planning Area.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project site contain a major riparian or other sensitive habitat (e.g., coastal sage scrub, oak woodland, sycamore riparian woodland, wetland, etc.)? *The Altadena CSD amendment is applicable to R-2 and R-3 zones with provisions that address height, building stepback, and landscaping. Any future proposed development projects would be subject to the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance.*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? *Some areas of the Altadena community do contain oak trees. The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. Any future proposed development projects would be subject to the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance.*
f.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)? *Due to its proximity to the Angeles National Forest and Eaton Canyon, the Altadena community may contain sensitive species habitats. The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development.*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)? *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☒ Oak Tree Permit ☒ERB/SEATAC Review

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address biota concerns. Properties containing oak trees will be subject to the Oak Tree Ordinance.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **biotic resources**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 4. Archaeological / Historical / Paleontological

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site in or near an area containing known archaeological resources or containing features (drainage course, spring, knoll, rock outcroppings, or oak trees) which indicate potential archaeological sensitivity? *The Altadena CSD amendment applies to R-2 and R-3 zones within the community. Some areas of the community contain a drainage course or oak trees.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? *The community of Altadena is highly urbanized and does not contain rock formations that indicate potential paleontological resources.*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? *The community of Altadena contains the following historic structures/site: Christmas Tree Lane, Crank House, Farnsworth County Park, Zane Grey Estate, Keyes Bungalow, Mt Lowe Railway, Pacific Electric Railway Company Substation No. 8, Scripps Hall.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. All future proposed development projects would be subject to appropriate environmental reviews.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Phase I Archaeology Report

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address archaeological, historical, and paleontological concerns. Such reviews include a Phase I Archaeology Report to address issues where identified.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **archaeological, historical**, or **paleontological** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 5. Mineral Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project 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?

Pleistocene alluvium or marine terrace deposits (Pfm), Pleistocene terrace deposits (Pc), holocene alluvium (Hc) can be found within the Altadena Community Planning Area as noted in the 1980 Los Angeles County Safety Element - Engineering Geologic Materials Map but no development is being proposed as part of the Altadena CSD amendment. The California Department of Conservation Mineral Resources Zones 2 (1994) map depicts mineral resource zones to the southwest and southeast of the community.

b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource discovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. It is a policy document that addresses height, building stepback, and landscaping in R-2 and R-3 zones within the community. Any future development proposals will be regulated by the existing community plan.

c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address mineral resources concerns.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **mineral** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒Less than significant/No impact

RESOURCES - 6. Agriculture Resources

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmla Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Ager non-agricultural use? *The community of Altadena does not contain any Prime Farmland, Unique Far or Farmland of Statewide Importance as depicted on the California Departm Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map (2006).*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act contract? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landsc within R-2 and R-3 zones. While there are approximately 55 acres of agric zoning located in the Angeles National Forest, these provisions do not ap agriculturally zoned land. Los Angeles County does not participate in the Willia Act program.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landsc within R-2 and R-3 zones. While there are approximately 55 acres of agricu zoning located in the Angeles National Forest, these provisions do not app agriculturally zoned land. Los Angeles County does not participate in the Willia Act program.*
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulati on **agriculture** resources?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒Less than significant/No im

RESOURCES - 7. Visual Qualities

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site substantially visible from or will it obstruct views along a scenic highway (as shown on the Scenic Highway Element), or is it located within a scenic corridor or will it otherwise impact the viewshed? *There are no scenic highways or corridors in Altadena.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? *The Altadena Community Planning Area contains riding and hiking trails, however, physical structures are not proposed that would obstruct views of trails.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? *The community of Altadena is heavily urbanized.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones in Altadena, a heavily urbanized community.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping and thus these restrictions would reduce substantial sun shadow, light, and glare problems.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration): *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design ☐ Visual Report ☐ Compatible Use

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address visual quality concerns.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **scenic** qualities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 1. Traffic/Access

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project contain 25 dwelling units, or more and is it located in an area with known congestion problems (roadway or intersections)? *Development is not being proposed as part of the Altadena CSD amendment. The provisions regulate height, building stepback, and landscaping in an urbanized community.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions? *There are no provisions for additional development and thus no additional traffic would be generated.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions? *There are no provisions for additional development and thus no parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic would result.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? *There are no provisions for additional development. Any future development projects would be subject to safety provisions regulated by Public Works and the Fire Department.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded? *There are no provisions for additional development and thus no additional traffic would be generated.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? *The Altadena CSD amendment will not prohibit or limit bus turnouts, bicycle racks, or other forms of alternative transportation.*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☒ Project Design ☐ Traffic Report ☐ Consultation with Traffic & Lighting Division

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address traffic and access concerns.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **traffic/access** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
				The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. Any future development projects would occur under current community plan and zoning regulations.
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
				The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. Any future development projects would occur under current community plan and zoning regulations.
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste Ordinance No. 6130

☒ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **sewage disposal** facilities?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 3. Education

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. The regulations address height, building stepback, and landscaping. Any future development projects would be authorized under the existing community plan and zoning. No additional development beyond what is currently allowed will be authorized.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. The regulations address height, building stepback, and landscaping. Any future development projects would be authorized under the existing community plan and zoning. No additional development beyond what is currently allowed will be authorized.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. The regulations address height, building stepback, and landscaping. Any future development projects would be authorized under the existing community plan and zoning. No additional development beyond what is currently allowed will be authorized.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. The regulations address height, building stepback, and landscaping. Any future development projects would be authorized under the existing community plan and zoning. No additional development beyond what is currently allowed will be authorized.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☒ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Site Dedication ☒ Government Code Section 65995 ☒ Library Facilities Mitigation Fee

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **educational** facilities/services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?

The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. Thus, there is no additional density that would be created that could adversely affect fire or sheriff response time.

b.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?

The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. Thus, there is no additional density that would be created that could impose special fire or law enforcement problems.

c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Fire Mitigation Fees

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **fire/sheriff** services?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

SERVICES - 5. Utilities/Other Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate public water supply to meet domestic needs or to have an inadequate ground water supply and proposes water wells? *Project site is served by public water.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? *Proposed project does not involve any specific development which requires water for fire fighting.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. It regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping. It does not authorize additional development. Any future proposed development projects would occur under the existing community plan and zoning.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development. It regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping. It does not authorize additional development. Any future proposed development projects would occur under the existing community plan and zoning.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	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 or facilities (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, roads)? *The height, building stepback, and landscaping provision proposed by the Altadena CSD amendment would apply to government facilities but would not impact services such as fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or roads.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Plumbing Code Ordinance No. 2269 ☒ Water Code Ordinance No. 7834

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☒ Project Design

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address utility and other service concerns.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) relative to **utilities/services**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 1. General

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in an inefficient use of energy resources?
				The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping. Provisions would allow for opportunities for solar heating.
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
				The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping. As a hilly urbanized community, the provisions will not alter patterns or character of the community.
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
				The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones in the community. Such regulations will not result in a reduction of agricultural land.
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ State Administrative Code, Title 24, Part 5, T-20 (Energy Conservation)

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot size ☒ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Proposed amendment will regulate the design of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It regulates height, building stepbacks, and landscaping. Any future development proposals will undergo appropriate reviews to address additional concerns.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to any of the above factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 2. Environmental Safety

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Are any hazardous materials used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. Such regulations will not induce the use, transport, production, handling, or storage of hazardous materials.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. Such regulations will not induce the use of pressurized tanks or storage of hazardous wastes.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? *Residential units, schools, and hospitals may be located within 500 feet of R-2 and R-3 zones but would not be adversely affected by provisions that regulate height, building stepback, and landscaping.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Have there been previous uses which indicate residual soil toxicity of the site or is the site located within two miles downstream of a known groundwater contamination source within the same watershed? *The community of Altadena is located at the base of the foothills. There is no known groundwater contamination source.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. Any future proposed development projects would be subject to provisions under existing safety regulations.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project generate hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. Any future proposed development projects would be subject to provisions under existing safety regulations.*
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard to the public or environment? *The community of Altadena does not contain hazardous materials sites as referenced in the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database.*
h.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project result in a safety hazard for people in a project area located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip? *The community of Altadena is not located within an airport land use plan nor is it within the vicinity of any private airstrips or public airports.*
I.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. Any future development proposals will not impair or interfere with emergency response or evacuation plans.*
j.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

☐ Toxic Clean up Plan

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact relative to **public safety**?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property? *The Altadena CSD amendment establishes design guidelines within R-2 and R-3 zones. No development is being proposed. Zone changes that may conflict with the plan designation are not proposed as part of this amendment.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property? *The Altadena CSD amendment establishes design guidelines within R-2 and R-3 zones. No development is being proposed. The height, building stepback, and landscaping provisions is consistent with the current zoning designations.*
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	☐	☒	☐	Hillside Management Criteria?
	☐	☒	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	☐	☐	☐	Other? *N/A*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project physically divide an established community? *No development is being proposed as part of the Altadena CSD amendment.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **land use** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

OTHER FACTORS - 4. Population/Housing/Employment/Recreation

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. No development is being proposed. Any future development proposals would be regulated by the existing community plan which outlines the population projection.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project induce substantial direct or indirect growth in an area (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. No development is being proposed and thus does not induce direct or indirect growth.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? *The Altadena CSD amendment addresses the aesthetics of structures and does not propose to change the use of residential zones that could displace existing housing.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)? *The Altadena CSD amendment regulates height, building stepback, and landscaping within R-2 and R-3 zones. No development is being proposed and thus does not result in a job/housing imbalance or increase in VMT.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents? *The Altadena CSD amendment does not propose any development nor will it increase density. Any future development projects would be regulated by the existing community plan.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? *The Altadena CSD amendment is not proposing any development and thus would not displace people or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Any future development proposals would occur under the current community plan and zoning code.*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ **MITIGATION MEASURES** / ☐ **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the physical environment due to **population, housing, employment**, or **recreational** factors?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Based on this Initial Study, the following findings are made:

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project have the potential to substantially 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?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project have possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? "Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of an individual 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.
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the environmental effects of the project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on the environment?

☐ Potentially significant ☐ Less than significant with project mitigation ☒ Less than significant/No impact

ATTACHMENT 6: LEGAL NOTICE OF BOARD HEARING

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 22 (ZONING ORDINANCE)
OF THE LOS ANGELES COUNTY CODE

ALTADENA COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT (CSD) AMENDMENT: The objective of the CSD amendment is to establish new development standards and design guidelines for R-2 and R-3 zoned properties to ensure compatibility of new structures with surrounding residential properties.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has recommended approval of an amendment to the Altadena Community Standards District for the unincorporated community of Altadena.

NOTICE IS ALSO HEREBY GIVEN that a public hearing will be held before the Board of Supervisors, Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012 at **9:30 a.m. on** _____ pursuant to Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code and Title 7 of the Government Code of the State of California (Planning and Zoning Law) for the purpose of hearing testimony relative to the adoption of the above mentioned amendment.

Written comments may be sent to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors at the above address. If you do not understand this notice or need more information, please contact Ms. Thuy Hua at (213) 974-6476 between 7:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m., Monday through Thursday, or email her at *thua@planning.lacounty.gov*. Project materials will also be available on the Planning website at *http://planning.lacounty.gov/docOrd.htm*.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and County Guidelines, a Negative Declaration has been prepared that shows that the proposed ordinance will not have a significant effect on the environment.

"ADA ACCOMMODATIONS: If you require reasonable accommodations or auxiliary aid and services such as material in alternate format or a sign language interpreter, please contact the Americans with Disabilities Act Coordinator at (213) 974-6488 (Voice) or (213) 617-2292 (TDD), with at least three business days notice."

Si no entiende esta noticia o necesita más información, por favor llame este número (213) 974-6476.

_____
SACHI A. HAMAI
EXECUTIVE OFFICER-CLERK OF
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

ATTACHMENT 7: LIST OF PERSONS TO BE NOTIFIED

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

LIST OF PERSONS TO BE NOTIFIED

The *List of Persons to be Notified* has been submitted to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors.