Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

December 16, 2008

Bruce W. McClendon FAICP
Director of Planning

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 REQUIRE A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN THE A-2 (HEAVY AGRICULTURAL) ZONE (ALL SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS) (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 County Code to require a Conditional Use Permit for private schools in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone, as reflected in the draft ordinance.

3. Instruct County Counsel to prepare an ordinance amending the County Code as recommended by the Regional Planning Commission.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

On October 7, 2008, your Board adopted a motion that instructed the Director of Planning to prepare an ordinance that amends the County Code to require a Conditional Use Permit for private schools in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone and to present the ordinance to the Regional Planning Commission for consideration in a public hearing within 90 days.

According to Section 22.56.010 of the County Code, a conditional use is "a use which because of characteristics peculiar to it, or because of its size, technological process or type of equipment, or because of its location with reference to surroundings, street or highway width, traffic generation or other demands on public services, requires special consideration relative to placement at specific locations in the zone or zones where classified to insure proper integration with other existing or permitted uses in the same zone or zones." The County Code provides for Conditional Use Permits for such uses, requiring discretionary approval through the public hearing process.

Ordinance 10,366, effective November 5, 1971, was an amendment to the County Code that classified private schools as a conditional use in the R-1 (Single Family Residence) Zone and in the A-1 (Light Agricultural) Zone, requiring a Conditional Use Permit. However, this ordinance did not classify private schools as a conditional use in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone, and they require only a Director's Review in that zone. The Director's Review procedure does not involve discretionary approval through the public hearing process.

Many of the unincorporated areas currently zoned A-2, including rural communities in the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys, are similar to those currently zoned R-1 and A-1 in that they are developed with single family uses and maintain a residential character. Private schools merit careful review in these areas, as they may be incompatible with surrounding residential and agricultural uses and have the potential to increase demands on public infrastructure and to generate noise and traffic. Many areas currently zoned A-2 have limited infrastructure capacity, as they lack public water and sewer service or streets and highways of substantial width. Therefore the Conditional Use Permit requirement in the R-1 and A-1 Zones should be extended to the A-2 Zone.

The proposed ordinance is consistent with Policy 8 of the Land Use Element of the County General Plan, which states "Protect the character of residential neighborhoods by preventing the intrusion of incompatible uses that would cause environmental degradation such as excessive noise, noxious fumes, glare, shadowing, and traffic" (Page III-12), for the reasons discussed above. The proposed ordinance is also consistent with previous policy actions in specific unincorporated communities. The Santa Monica Mountains North Area Community Standards District (CSD), adopted by your Board on August 20, 2002, classified private schools as a conditional use in all zones, including the A-2 Zone, within the boundaries of that CSD. Similarly, the proposed Santa Monica Mountains Coastal Zone CSD, approved by your Board on October 30, 2007, would classify private schools as a conditional use in all zones, including the A-2 Zone, within the boundaries of that CSD.

On November 24, 2008, the Regional Planning Commission considered the ordinance in a public hearing and recommended that it be adopted by your Board.

IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNTYWIDE STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The proposed ordinance promotes Goal 1 of the County's Strategic Plan pertaining to "Service Excellence" through the development of an amendment to the County Code that is responsive to the need of citizens in A-2 Zones to maintain the quality of life in their unincorporated communities.

FISCAL IMPACT

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

FINANCING

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

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The Regional Planning Commission conducted a public hearing regarding the proposed ordinance on November 24, 2008. The Commission heard testimony from four individuals in support of the proposal and two testifiers in opposition to the proposal.

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 Section 6061, 65090, and 65856 of the Government Code relating to notice of public hearing.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

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

NEGATIVE DECLARATION/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

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 ordinance will have a

significant effect on the environment. Therefore a Negative Declaration was prepared in accordance with Section 15070 of the California Environmental Quality Act guidelines. Copies of the proposed Negative Declaration were transmitted to the County Clerk and Valencia and Lancaster Libraries for public review. In addition, public notice was published in one newspaper of general circulation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092. Two comments were received during the public review period.

Based on the attached Negative Declaration, adoption of the proposed ordinance will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Respectfully submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

Bruce W. McClendon, FAICP
Director of Planning

BWM:RCH:MWG

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 Executive 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 amendment to Title 22 (Planning and Zoning) to require a Conditional Use Permit for private schools in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone
REQUEST:	Adoption of the proposed amendment to Title 22; Advance Planning Case No. 200800011
LOCATION:	Countywide
APPLICANT OR SOURCE:	Board of Supervisors directive
STAFF CONTACT:	Mr. Mitch Glaser at (213) 974-6476
RPC HEARING DATE:	November 24, 2008
RPC RECOMMENDATION:	Board public hearing to consider adoption of the proposed amendment
MEMBERS VOTING AYE:	Commissioners Bellamy, Helsley, Modugno, Rew, and Valadez
MEMBERS VOTING NAY:	None
MEMBERS ABSENT:	None
MEMBERS ABSTAINING:	None
KEY ISSUES:	A private school is a use that may be incompatible with surrounding residential and agricultural uses and has the potential to increase demands on public infrastructure and to generate noise and traffic. Private schools require a Conditional Use Permit in the A-1 (Light Agricultural) Zone, but not in the A-2 Zone. The Conditional Use Permit requirement involves thorough review of a proposed use as well as discretionary approval through the public hearing process.

MAJOR POINTS FOR: The Conditional Use Permit requirement will ensure that a proposed private school is compatible with surrounding uses and that any potential adverse impacts are identified and mitigated.

MAJOR POINTS AGAINST: The Conditional Use Permit requirement entails greater costs and lengthier permit processing time.

Attachment 2: Summary of Regional Planning Commission Proceedings

REGIONAL PLANNNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEEDINGS

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO COUNTY CODE TITLE 22 (PLANNING AND ZONING) TO REQUIRE A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN THE A-2 (HEAVY AGRICULTURAL) ZONE

November 24, 2008

The Commission conducted a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to Title 22 to require a Conditional Use Permit for private schools in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone. The amendment was initiated by a Board of Supervisors motion on October 7, 2008.

Staff made a presentation concerning the proposed amendment. Staff stated that a private school was a use that could be incompatible with surrounding residential and agricultural uses and could increase demands on public infrastructure and to generate noise and traffic. Staff stated that the purpose of a Conditional Use Permit is to ensure careful evaluation of such a use and to require discretionary approval through the public hearing process. Staff elaborated on the reasons why the proposed amendment was appropriate, including the existing Conditional Use Permit requirement for private schools in the A-1 (Light Agricultural) Zone, the residential character of many areas in the A-2 Zone, compatibility with the goals of the Countywide General Plan, and consistency with previous policy actions in specific communities.

Four members of the public spoke in favor of the proposed amendment, and two members of the public spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment.

The Commission closed the public hearing and approved the proposed amendment. Commissioners Bellamy, Helsley, Modugno, Rew, and Valadez voted aye. Staff was then instructed to transmit the item to the Board of Supervisors for consideration in a public hearing.

Attachment 3: Resolution of the Regional Planning Commission

RESOLUTION
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has reviewed the matter of an amendment to Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Los Angeles County Code to require a Conditional Use Permit for private schools in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone.

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission finds as follows:

1. On October 7, 2008, the Board of Supervisors adopted a motion that instructed the Director of Planning to prepare an ordinance that requires a Conditional Use Permit for private schools in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone and to present it to the Regional Planning Commission for approval within 90 days.

2. According to Section 22.56.010 of the County Code, a conditional use is "a use which because of characteristics peculiar to it, or because its size, technological process or type of equipment, or because of its location with reference to surroundings, street or highway width, traffic generation or other demands on public services, requires special consideration relative to placement at specific locations in the zone or zones where classified to insure proper integration with other existing permitted uses in the same zone or zones." The County Code provides for Conditional Use Permits for such uses, requiring discretionary approval through the public hearing process.

3. Many of the unincorporated areas currently zoned A-2, including rural communities in the Santa Clarita and Antelope Valleys, are developed with single family uses and maintain a residential character.

4. Private schools merit special consideration relative to their placement at specific locations in areas currently zoned A-2, as they may be incompatible with surrounding residential uses and have the potential to increase demands on public infrastructure and to generate noise and traffic. Therefore private schools should require a Conditional Use Permit in the A-2 Zone.

5. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act, an Initial Study was prepared for the project that demonstrates that this regulatory action will not have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the Initial Study, Department of Regional Planning staff 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 amendment to Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Los Angeles County Code to require a Conditional Use Permit for private schools in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone.
2. Certify completion of and approve the attached Negative Declaration and find that the amendment to Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Los Angeles County Code will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. Adopt the attached ordinance amending Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Los Angeles County Code 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 November 24, 2008.

By _____

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

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY COUNSEL

By _____

Elaine Lemke
Principal Deputy County Counsel
Property Division

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 schools in Zone A-2.

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

SECTION 1. Section 22.24.140 is hereby amended to read as follows:

22.44.140 Uses subject to director's review and approval. If site plans therefore are first submitted to and approved by the director, premises in Zone A-2 may be used for:

. . .

B. The following additional uses:

. . .

~~Schools, through grade 12, accredited, including appurtenant facilities, which offer instruction required to be taught in the public schools by the Education Code of the state of California in which no pupil is physically restrained, but excluding trade or commercial schools.~~

. . .

SECTION 2. Section 22.44.150 is hereby amended to read as follows:

22.44.150 Uses subject to permits. Property in Zone A-2 may be used for:

A. The following uses, provided a conditional use permit has first been obtained as provided in Part 1 of Chapter 22.56, and while such permit is in full force and effect in conformity with the conditions of such permit for:

. . .

-- Schools, through grade 12, accredited, including appurtenant facilities, which offer instruction required to be taught in the public schools by the Education Code of the state of California in which no pupil is physically restrained, but excluding trade or commercial schools.

. . .

Attachment 5: Environmental Document

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

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: R2008-01693

1. DESCRIPTION: The proposed project consists of a zoning ordinance that would require a Conditional Use Permit for a school in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone throughout the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. This is not a development project.

2. LOCATION: Unincorporated Los Angeles County

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: Rick Kuo
Regional Planning Assistant II

DATE: September 29, 2008

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: R2008-01693

CASE: RADVT200800011

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

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

C.S. Map Date:	September 29, 2008	**Staff Member:**	Rick Kuo
Thomas Guide:	Various	**USGS Quad:**	Various
Location:	Countywide		
Description of Project:	The proposed project consists of a zoning ordinance that would require a Conditional Use Permit for a school in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone throughout the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. This is not a development project.		
Gross Area:	2,649 square miles		
Environmental Setting:	Countywide (urban, suburban, non-urban, rural)		
Zoning:	A-2 (Heavy Agricultural)		
General Plan:	Countywide		
Community/Area Wide Plan:	Countywide		

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
- ☒ Caltrans

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 Santa Clarita
- ☒ City of Los Angeles
- ☒ City of Palmdale
- ☒ City of Lancaster
- ☒ CSU Fullerton
- ☐
- ☐

Regional Significance

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

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ DPW: Traffic & Lighting, Geotechnical & Materials Engineering, Drainage and Grading
- ☒ Health Services
- ☒ Fire, Sheriff, Library
- ☒ Parks and Recreation
- ☒ Sanitation District

CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg	ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details) 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	☒	☐	☐	

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: *Countywide*

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: *Rick Kuo, Regional Planning Asst. II* Date: September 29, 2008

Approved by: *Mitch Glaser, Supervising Regional Planner* Date: September 29, 2008

☒ This proposed project is exempt from Fish and Game CEQA filling fees. There is no substantial evidence that the proposed project will have potential for an adverse effect on wildlife or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. (Fish & Game Code 753.5).

☐ Determination appealed--see attached sheet.

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? *All of the zoning ordinance planning area lies within a general region of known fault zones and seismic activity (California Seismic Hazard Zones Map and Los Angeles County Safety Element – Fault Rupture Hazards & Seismicity Map).*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? *Portions of the planning area contain landslides and may not be suitable for development of schools as would be allowed by the proposed zoning ordinance (Los Angeles County Safety Element – Landslide Inventory Map).*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an area having high slope instability? *Portions of the planning area have high slope instability and may not be suitable for development of schools as would be allowed by the proposed zoning ordinance.*
d.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site subject to high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction? *Portions of the planning area contain high subsidence, high groundwater level, liquefaction, or hydrocompaction, and may not be suitable for development of schools as would be allowed by the proposed zoning ordinance (Los Angeles County Safety Element – Liquefaction Susceptibility and Shallow and Perched Ground Water Maps).*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard? *The proposed project does not involve any development but would allow future development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a Conditional Use Permit. Such development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to assess impact from geotechnical concerns.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of more than 25%? *Grading will not be required by the proposed zoning ordinance.*
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? *Some portions of the planning area may contain expansive soil.*
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 is a zoning ordinance that would require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a school in the A-2 Zone throughout the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. No geology or soil impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed project as development of schools are not involved. Any future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review 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? *Various drainage courses exist throughout the planning area (Thomas Guide).*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? *There are portions of the planning area that are located on 100-year flood zone areas (Los Angeles County Safety Element – Flood Inundation Hazards Map).*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions? *There are portions of the planning area that may be subject to high mudflow conditions.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run off? *Grading will not be required by the proposed zoning ordinance.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? *The proposed zoning ordinance would require a CUP for a school in the A-2 Zone throughout the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County and would not involve 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

The proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would allow development of schools in the A-2 Zone throughout the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. Such development projects facilitated by the ordinance may expose more residents to potential flood related hazards in certain areas. These projects will be subject to appropriate environmental review and building permits from the Department of Public Works 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)? *Most of the northern portion of the planning area is located in Fire Zone 4 (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? *There are portions of the planning area that have inadequate access, however, development is not involved as part of the proposed zoning ordinance project.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? *The proposed ordinance does not involve dwelling units.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water pressure to meet fire flow standards? *There are portions of the planning area that have inadequate water pressure to meet fire flow standards, however, development projects are not proposed that would exacerbate the situation. As individual development of schools is proposed, they will be subject to Fire Department regulations for fire flow standards.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)? *The planning area is consisted of heavy agricultural zone and would not accommodate uses such as refineries, flammables, or explosives manufacturing.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? *The planning area is consisted of heavy agricultural zone and would not create a potentially dangerous fire hazard.*
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 is a zoning ordinance that would allow the development of schools in the A-2 Zone with a CUP. Impacts from fire hazards are not significant as uses posting dangerous fire hazards would not be permitted in A-2 Zone. Future development of schools as allowed by the proposed zoning ordinance will require appropriate environmental review to address potential fire hazard concerns through implementation 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)? *There are various high noise sources such as freeways and airports in the vicinity of the planning area.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? *There are schools and senior citizen facilities in the planning area, however, the proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development and would not impact these sensitive uses.*
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 proposed project is a zoning ordinance which would permit future development of schools in A-2 Zone through a CUP. Development is not proposed as part of the proposed zoning ordinance.*
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 proposed project is a zoning ordinance which would permit future development of schools in A-2 Zone through a CUP. Development is not proposed as part of the proposed zoning ordinance.*
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

The proposed zoning ordinance will not create additional development. It will regulate the development of schools in A-2 Zone through a CUP. Future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to address potential 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? *There are portions of the planning area that are served by individual water wells and have water quality problems.*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? *There are portions of the planning area that rely on the use of private sewage disposal systems.*
	☒	☐	☐	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 proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any development project. It would permit the future development of schools in A-2 Zone. Such development proposals will be subject to compliance 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 proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any development project. It would permit the future development of schools in A-2 Zone. Such development proposals will be subject to compliance 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

The proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would permit the development of schools in A-2 Zone. Development is not involved as part of this proposed zoning ordinance. Any future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review 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 proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would permit the development of schools in the A-2 Zone. Residential or commercial development that will exceed the State's criteria for regional significance is not being proposed.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located near a freeway or heavy industrial use? *The proposed project is a zoning ordinance and would not be considered a sensitive use. Any future development proposals for schools will have to meet AQMD thresholds.*
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? *The proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would allow development of schools in the A-2 Zone. It does not involve any development and will not increase local emissions. Any future development proposals for schools 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 proposed project does not involve development and would not generate obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions. Future development projects for schools as would be allowed by the proposed project will require appropriate environmental review to address air quality concerns.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any development and would not obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve any development and would 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)? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve development and would not increase criteria pollutants.*
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors: *N/A*

STANDARD CODE REQUIREMENTS

☒ Health and Safety Code Section 40506

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

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

Proposed is a zoning ordinance that would allow the development of schools in the A-2 Zone with a CUP. It will not have any impact to any air quality concerns. Future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review 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? *Many portions of the planning area are relatively undisturbed and natural and located within various SEA's.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas? *The proposed project is a zoning ordinance that does not require grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements.*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue, dashed line, located on the project site? *Various drainage courses exist in the planning area (Thomas Guide).*
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.)? *Various riparian and sensitive habitats exist throughout the planning area.*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? *The planning area contains various oak and other unique trees. Future proposed development of schools will 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.)? *The planning area contains habitats for various sensitive species.*
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

The project area contains rich and varied habitat areas. The proposed zoning ordinance would allow development of schools in A-2 Zone through a CUP. Although the CSD will not create additional development, any future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to address biota concerns. Properties will also be subject to the Oak Tree Ordinance and ERB/SEATAC requirements.

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? *There are areas within the planning area that contain drainage channels or oak trees, however, development is not being proposed*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources? *The proposed zoning ordinance may contain rock formations that indicate potential paleontological resources, however, development is not being proposed.*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? *The planning area may contain sites on the National Register of Historic Places or California Office of Historic Preservation, however, development is not being proposed. Future development of schools as would be allowed by the proposed zoning ordinance will be subject to appropriate environmental review for historic resources.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any development and would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not propose any development. All future proposed development of schools will be subject to appropriate environmental review for paleontological resources.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☐ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☒ Phase I Archaeology Report

The proposed zoning ordinance would not create development. It would require a CUP for a school in the A-2 Zone. Future proposed development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to address archaeological, historical, and paleontological concerns. Such review will 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? *The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. It is a zoning ordinance that would allow future development of schools on A-2 Zone through a Conditional Use Permit.*
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 proposed zoning ordinance would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. It would allow future development of schools on A-2 Zone through a CUP.*
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

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

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

The proposed zoning ordinance would allow development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP but would not establish additional development standards that would affect availability of known mineral resources. Any future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to address concerns relating to mineral resources.

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 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? *There may be prime farmland located throughout some portions of the planning area (California Department of Conservation 2006 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map). The proposed zoning ordinance would not convert farmland into non-agricultural uses, however, it would allow future development of schools in A-2 Zone through a CUP.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act Contract? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development, however, it would allow future development of schools in A-2 Zone through a CUP.*
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 proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development, however, it would allow future development of schools in A-2 Zone through a CUP.*
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? _____

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

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

The proposed zoning ordinance would not create additional development, but would allow future development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP. Such development will require appropriate environmental review to assess impacts to agricultural resources.

CONCLUSION

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

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

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 may be visual resources located throughout the planning area. However, the proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would not create new development obstructing these visual resources.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? *There may be various trails located within the vicinity of the planning area.*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? *Portions of the planning area in the A-2 Zone are undeveloped which may contain unique aesthetic features, however, development projects are not proposed.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? *The proposed zoning ordinance would require a Conditional Use Permit for a school in the A-2 Zone and would not involve out-of-character uses.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any development. It would allow the development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or land form alteration): *N/A*

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

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

The proposed zoning ordinance will not create additional development, but would allow development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP. Any future development proposals will require appropriate environmental review 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)? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve dwelling units, and there are no significant congestion problems in the vicinity of the A-2 Zone of the planning area.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development or standards that will result in any hazardous traffic conditions. It would allow the development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not create development or standards that would result in parking problems.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not create any development. Any future development projects for schools in the A-2 Zone will be subject to safety provisions regulated by the Department of Public Works and the Fire Department.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Will the congestion management program (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds of 50 peak hour vehicles added by project traffic to a CMP highway system intersection or 150 peak hour trips added by project traffic to a mainline freeway link be exceeded? *The proposed zoning ordinance is not a development project that generates vehicle trips. It is a zoning ordinance that would require a CUP for a school in the A-2 Zone.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? *The proposed zoning ordinance will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

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

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

The proposed zoning ordinance will not create additional development, but will allow the development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP. Any future development proposals for schools will require appropriate environmental review 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 proposed zoning ordinance would not create capacity problems as development is not proposed. It would require a CUP for a school in the A-2 Zone. Any future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to address sewage concerns.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site? *The proposed zoning ordinance would not create capacity problems as development is not proposed. It would require a CUP for a school in the A-2 Zone. Any future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to address sewage concerns.*
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**

The zoning ordinance will not create additional development, but will allow development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP. Any future development proposals will require appropriate environmental review to address sewage concerns.

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 proposed zoning ordinance does not involve student-generating development.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve student-generating development.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve student-generating development.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve student-generating development nor would it create substantial library impacts.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

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

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

The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any development and will not result in impacts to educational and library facilities. It would allow development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP. Any future development of schools in A-2 Zone will require appropriate environmental review to address concerns relating to school and library capacity.

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 proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any development and would not create staffing or response time problems at any fire or Sherriff's station.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any special fire or law enforcement.*
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

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

☐ Fire Mitigation Fees

The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any development requiring fire and sheriff's services. It would allow the development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP. Future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to address concerns relating to fire and sheriff response and operations.

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? *There are portions of the planning area that are served by individual water wells. However, there are no water impacts as the proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would allow development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP. Use of water is not required.*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs? *Water supply and pressure may be inadequate in some portions of the planning area. However, there are no water impacts as the proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development. Water for fire fighting needs is not required.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve any development and would not require utility services.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? *The proposed project is a zoning ordinance and does not involve any development.*
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 proposed zoning ordinance does not propose any development. It would not result in any substantial adverse physical impacts to governmental facilities.*
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

The proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would allow the development of schools in the A-2 Zone and would not impact utility services throughout the planning area. Any future development of school will require appropriate environmental review 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 proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development projects, and therefore will not impact use of energy resources.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development that would result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the planning area.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any development and would not convert agricultural land to other non-agricultural uses. However, it would allow the development of schools in A-2 Zone through a CUP.*
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

The proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would require a CUP for a school in the A-2 Zone. It would not involve development and there would not be any impacts to agricultural land. Any future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to address concerns relating to energy resources and change in patterns, scale, and character of the community.

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 proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would allow the development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP. Hazardous materials that are used, transported, produced, handled, or stored on-site are not proposed.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site? *The proposed project is a zoning ordinance that does not involve development. Use of pressurized tanks are not involved.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? *The proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would require a CUP for a school in the A-2 Zone. It would not affect residential units, schools, or hospitals as development is not involved.*
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? *There are no known residual soil toxicity or groundwater contamination in the planning area.*
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 proposed zoning ordinance does not involve any development and would not create hazards to the public or the environment through the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment.*
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 proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development projects that and would not generate hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste.*
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? *There are hazardous materials sites in the planning area as referenced in the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database. Future development of these sites for schools will require appropriate environmental review to assess hazardous materials.*
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 proposed zoning ordinance would not expose people to any safety hazard as development is not involved.*
I.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? *The project zoning ordinance would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.*
j.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

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

The proposed zoning ordinance will not create additional development. It would allow the development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP. Future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to assess environmental safety concerns.

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 proposed project is a zoning ordinance that would allow the development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property? *Development of schools is not currently permitted in the A-2 Zone, however, the proposed zoning ordinance would permit development of schools through a Conditional Use Permit.*
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	☐	☒	☐	Hillside Management Criteria?
	☐	☒	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria? *No changes to the Hillside Management or SEA criteria, standards or their applicability are proposed.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project physically divide an established community? *The proposed zoning ordinance is not proposing any development projects that would physically divide the planning area.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

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

The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development that would be inconsistent with the current plan or zoning designation. It would require a CUP for the development of schools in the A-2 Zone. Future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to address land use consistency.

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 proposed project is a zoning ordinance that does not involve development and would not induce population growth.*
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 proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development and would not induce direct or indirect growth in the planning area.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development and would not displace existing housing.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development and would not result in a job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in VMT.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not create demand for recreational facilities. It would allow development of schools in A-2 Zone through a CUP.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? *The proposed zoning ordinance does not involve development and would not displace substantial numbers of people. It would allow development of schools in the A-2 Zone through a CUP.*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

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

The proposed zoning ordinance does not create additional development, but will allow development of schools in A-2 Zone. Any future development of schools will require appropriate environmental review to address population, employment, and recreation concerns.

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

County of Los Angeles Public Library
7400 East Imperial Hwy., P.O. Box 7011, Downey, CA 90241-7011
(562) 940-8461, TELEFAX (562) 803-3032

Library

MARGARET DONNELLAN TODD
COUNTY LIBRARIAN

November 19, 2008

TO: Rick Kuo
Regional Planning Assistant II
Department of Regional Planning

FROM: Terri Maguire
Chief Deputy County Librarian

SUBJECT: **NOTICE OF CONSULTATION**
PROJECT NO. R2008-01693
(CUP FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN A-2 ZONE)

This is to respond to your request for comments on the Notice of Consultation for the above referenced project. On page 19, Section 3.d. of the Initial Study, we agree with your finding that the proposed project would not have an impact on library services. However, your comment regarding student-generating development is not relevant to impacts on library services.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Malou Rubio at (562) 940-8450.

TM:DF:MR:MB:dl
U:\STAFFSERVICES\DEVELOPER FEE\EIR\Project No. R2008-01693-NOC.doc

c: David Flint, Assistant Director, Finance and Planning
Malou Rubio, Staff Services
Robert Seal, Public Services Administration

Department of Toxic Substances Control

Linda S. Adams
Secretary for
Environmental Protection

Maureen F. Gorsen, Director
9211 Oakdale Avenue
Chatsworth, California 91311

Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

November 20, 2008

NOV 24 2008

Mr. Mitch Glaser (mglaser@planning.lacounty.gov)
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning
320 W. Temple St, Room 1354
Los Angeles, CA 90012

NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN THE A-2 ZONE, COUNTYWIDE, LOS ANGELES COUNTY, CALIFORNIA (SCH 2008101122)

Dear Mr. Glaser:

The Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has reviewed the Negative Declaration (ND), dated October 23, 2008, for the subject project. The due date to submit comments is November 21, 2008. Based on a review of the ND, DTSC would like to provide the following comments:

1. The proposed project consists of a zoning ordinance that would require a Conditional Use Permit for a school in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone throughout the unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County.

2. Since the site has previously been used for agricultural purposes, pesticides (e.g., DDT, DDE, toxaphene) and fertilizers (usually containing heavy metals) commonly used as part of agricultural operations are likely to be present. These agricultural chemicals are persistent and bio-accumulative toxic substances. DTSC recommends that these environmental concerns be investigated and possibly mitigated, in accordance with the "Interim Guidance for Sampling Agricultural Soils (Third Revision), dated August 2008." This Guidance should be followed to sample agricultural properties where development is anticipated.

3. For a school project near or on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, DTSC recommends that an environmental review, such as Preliminary Endangerment Assessment (PEA), be conducted at the school to estimate the potential threat to public health and/or the environment posed by the identified contamination (if there is any) and to determine if an expedited response action is required to reduce an existing or potential threat to public health and the environment. This environmental assessment should be conducted as part of the Initial Study process by the school.

If you would like to discuss this matter further, please contact me at (818) 717-6617.

Sincerely,

Ken Chiang
Senior Hazardous Substances Scientist
Brownfields and Environmental Restoration

cc: State Clearinghouse (State.clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov)
Office of Planning and Research

Mr. Guenther W. Moskat (Gmoskat@dtsc.ca.gov)
CEQA Tracking Center – Sacramento HQ

School Reading File – Chatsworth (cwherry@dtsc.ca.gov)

CEQA Reading File – Chatsworth

Attachment 6: Legal Notice of Board Hearing

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

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

PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN A-2 ORDINANCE:
This ordinance will require a Conditional Use Permit for Private Schools in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has recommended approval of an ordinance to require a Conditional Use Permit for private schools in the A-2 (Heavy Agricultural) Zone.

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 _____, 2009** 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 in Room 383 at the above address. If you do not understand this notice or need more information, please contact Mr. Mitch Glaser at (213) 974-6476 between 7:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday or e-mail him at *mglaser@planning.lacounty.gov*. Project materials will also be available on the Department of Regional 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) 974-4899.

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.