Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

Jon Sanabria
Acting Director of Planning

May 4, 2009

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 ESTABLISH THE SAN FRANCISQUITO CANYON 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 County Code to establish the San Francisquito Canyon Community Standards District (CSD), as reflected in the draft ordinance.

3. Instruct County Counsel to prepare an ordinance establishing the San Francisquito Canyon CSD 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 Community Standards Districts (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 San Francisquito Canyon is distinguished by its scenic natural setting and quiet rural character. However, rapid growth in the Santa Clarita Valley has increased development pressure on this community.

The San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association, a local citizen group, recognized the challenge of maintaining the area's unique quality of life while allowing new development that is consistent with the existing character of the community. For a year and a half, the Association worked with local residents, property owners, and staff from the Department of Regional Planning to draft a CSD that reflects the desires of the community.

The proposed CSD will establish new development standards that will only apply to properties within the boundaries of the San Francisquito Canyon area. These standards are intended to maintain the low densities, rural character, and significant natural resources of the community. The CSD includes regulations pertaining to minimum lot size for new subdivisions, residential development standards, street improvements, public trails, and significant ridgeline protection.

Los Angeles County General Plan policies encourage guidelines governing the scale and design of new development on a community-by-community basis. Establishing the San Francisquito Canyon CSD is therefore consistent with the County General Plan.

On April 15, 2009, the Regional Planning Commission considered the CSD in a public hearing and recommended that it be adopted by your Board, provided that minor revisions were made to the portions pertaining to street lighting, trails, and signs. Staff has since completed these minor revisions and incorporated them into the draft ordinance.

IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNTYWIDE STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The proposed CSD promotes Goal One 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 proposed San Francisquito Canyon CSD includes public input received during community meetings held in the City of Santa Clarita on October 7, 2008 and January 28, 2009. Additionally, staff held several meetings with representatives of the San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association and community members to receive additional input.

The Regional Planning Commission conducted a public hearing regarding the proposed CSD on April 15, 2009. The Commission heard testimony from six individuals, all of whom supported the proposal. The Commission recommended approval of the CSD by your Board, provided that minor revisions were made to the portions pertaining to street lighting, trails, and signs. Staff has since completed these minor revisions and incorporated them into the draft ordinance.

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 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 may 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.

A copy of the proposed Negative Declaration was transmitted to the County Clerk and the County Library in Valencia for public review. In addition, public notice was published in *The Signal*, a newspaper of general circulation, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21092. During the public comment period staff received one comment in support, a community petition consisting of 23 signatures in support, and four comments expressing concerns about various regulations within the CSD.

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

Respectfully submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

Jon Sanabria
Acting Director of Planning

JS:RCH:MWG:RK

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 establish the San Francisquito Canyon Community Standards District, which institutes development standards that are intended to maintain the low density, rural character, and significant natural resources of the San Francisquito Canyon community.
REQUEST:	Adoption of the proposed amendments to Title 22; Advance Planning Case No. 200800007.
LOCATION:	San Francisquito Canyon
APPLICANT OR SOURCE:	Regional Planning Commission directive
STAFF CONTACT:	Mr. Rick Kuo at (213) 974-6476
RPC HEARING DATE:	April 15, 2009
RPC RECOMMENDATION:	Board public hearing to consider adoption of the proposed amendment.
MEMBERS VOTING AYE:	Commissioners Bellamy, Rew, Valadez, Helsley, and Modugno
MEMBERS VOTING NAY:	None
MEMBERS ABSENT:	None
MEMBERS ABSTAINING:	None
KEY ISSUES:	Rapid growth in the Santa Clarita Valley has increased development pressure on the San Francisquito Canyon. The proposed CSD aims to maintain the area's unique quality of life while allowing new development that is consistent with the existing character of the community. Specific issues identified by the community and addressed by the CSD include minimum lot size for new subdivisions, residential development standards,

street improvements, public trails, and significant ridgeline protection.

MAJOR POINTS FOR: The proposed CSD provides community-specific development standards for issues where current Countywide policies do not address the needs of the San Francisquito Canyon area.

MAJOR POINTS AGAINST: Some property owners felt that the imposition of such standards could unreasonably restrict building on properties near designated significant ridgelines.

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 ESTABLISH A COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT (CSD) FOR THE UNINCORPORATED COMMUNITY OF SAN FRANCISQUITO CANYON

April 15, 2009

The Commission conducted a public hearing to consider the proposed amendment to Title 22 to establish a Community Standards District (CSD) for the unincorporated San Francisquito Canyon area. The proposed CSD would institute specific development standards that are intended to maintain the low densities, rural character, and significant natural resources of the community.

During the hearing, staff asked the Commission to consider the proposed San Francisquito Canyon CSD in response to a Commission directive issued on November 24, 2008. The staff presentation elaborated on the collaborative process undertaken with the San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association (SFCPA), property owners, residents, and other stakeholders, the justifications for the recommended development standards contained in the CSD, and the unique circumstances in the area that are not addressed by Countywide policy.

The Commission recognized the low density and rural character of the San Francisquito Canyon area and the fact that rapid growth in neighboring jurisdictions has increased development pressure on the area.

There were six members of the public who spoke in support of the proposed CSD. All six speakers belonged to the SFCPA. There were no other members speaking in opposition or with concerns.

The Commission closed the public hearing and approved the CSD, provided that minor revisions were made to the portions pertaining to street lighting, trails, and signs. All commissioners voted aye. Staff was then instructed to transmit the item to the Board of Supervisors for consideration.

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 relating to the San Francisquito Canyon Community Standards District (CSD); and

WHEREAS, the Regional Planning Commission finds as follows:

1. The unincorporated community of San Francisquito Canyon is part of the Fifth Supervisorial District. The area is located in the Santa Clarita Valley, bounded on the north and east by the Angeles National Forest, on the west by the community of Castaic, and on the south by the City of Santa Clarita.

2. The subject community is predominantly rural, and comprised of low-density agricultural zones.

3. In December 2007 staff from the Department of Regional Planning was contacted by representatives of the San Francisquito Canyon Preservation Association (SFCPA), who expressed the desire to create a new CSD in order to preserve the rural and scenic character of the area. Staff worked closely with the community and the SFCPA for over a year to achieve consensus on community standards.

4. Following numerous meetings with the SFCPA, DRP staff held two public meetings on October 7, 2008 and January 28, 2009, where community members overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for the proposed CSD.

5. The proposed CSD will help preserve the community character by limiting street improvements and establishing additional development standards pertaining to lot size and setbacks, public trails, and significant ridgeline protection.

6. 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, 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 relating to establishing the San Francisquito Canyon Community Standards District (CSD);

2. Certify completion of and adopt the attached Negative Declaration and find that the establishment of the San Francisquito Canyon CSD will not have a significant effect on the environment; and

3. Adopt the attached ordinance establishing the San Francisquito Canyon CSD, 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 April 15, 2009.

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, relating to establishing the San Francisquito Canyon Community Standards District.

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

SECTION 1. Section 22.44.110 is hereby amended to read as follows:

22.44.110 List of districts.

The following community standards districts are added by reference, together with all maps and provisions pertaining thereto:

District Number	District Name	Ordinance of Adoption	Date of Adoption
. . .	. . .	. . .	. . .
35	San Francisquito Canyon	2009-XXXX	X-X-2009

SECTION 2. Section 22.44.144 is hereby added to read as follows:

22.44.144 San Francisquito Canyon Community Standards District.

A. Intent and Purpose. The San Francisquito Canyon Community Standards District ("CSD") is established to protect and enhance the community's secluded rural, equestrian, and agricultural character as well as its natural features, including ridgelines, significant ecological areas, and flood plains. The standards contained in this CSD are intended to ensure reasonable access to public riding and hiking trails, encourage the keeping of animals, minimize the need for urban infrastructure, and preserve the beauty of this natural gateway into the Angeles National Forest.

B. District Boundary. The boundaries of this CSD are shown on the map following this section.

C. Applicability. This CSD shall apply to all development except site plan reviews and zoning conformance reviews submitted prior to the effective date of this ordinance.

D. Community-wide Development Standards.

1. Highway and Local Street Standards.

a. Highway Standards. Alternate rural highway standards shall be utilized for routes shown on the Highway Plan, except for locations where existing infrastructure or commercial and pedestrian traffic are such that the department of public works determines that curbs, gutters, and sidewalks are necessary for safety or to provide pedestrian access compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

b. Local Street Standards.

i. Local streets shall be limited to the use of the inverted shoulder cross-section with a paved width of 28 feet, except for locations where additional pavement is required for geometric improvements by the department of public works or where commercial, industrial, or institutional uses necessitate alternate designs, as determined by the department of public works. This limit excludes the width of any inverted shoulder or concrete flowline.

ii. New curbs, gutters, and sidewalks are prohibited unless deemed necessary for the safety of pedestrian and vehicular traffic by the department of public works after consultation with the department of regional planning.

2. Street Lighting. The addition of street lights is prohibited unless deemed necessary by the department of public works. Where installed:

a. Street lights shall be compatible in style and material with the poles on which they are mounted;

b. Street lights shall be placed the maximum distance apart with the minimum lumens allowable by the department of public works; and

c. Street lights shall be designed to prevent off-street illumination and glare. Fully shielded fixtures shall be used to deflect light away from adjacent parcels.

3. Exterior Lighting. (Reserved).

4. Utilities. (Reserved).

5. Signs.

a. Freestanding ranch entrance signs are permitted, provided that at least one unobstructed driveway is provided on a lot or parcel of land, as required by the fire department. Such signs are subject to the following standards:

i. On a lot or parcel of land, not more than one sign shall be placed at each entrance;

ii. The height of each sign shall not exceed 20 feet as measured from mean natural grade; and

iii. The surface area of each sign shall not exceed 20 square feet.

b. Signs that do not conform to the provisions of this subsection, but were legally established as of the effective date of the ordinance creating this CSD, may remain subject to the provisions of Section 22.56.1540.A.2.

6. Vegetation Conservation. (Reserved).

7. Trails.

a. When required by the department of parks and recreation in accordance with the trails map in the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan, all new land divisions, including minor land divisions, shall contain accessible multi-use trails for pedestrian hiking and walking, mountain bicycling and equestrian uses. Access to these trails must be in the vicinity of the subject land division. These trails shall provide connections to significant recreational uses, including but not limited to open space areas, parks, trail heads, bike paths, historical trails or sites, equestrian centers, equestrian staging areas, camp grounds, and conservation or nature preserve areas.

b. Trail construction shall be completed in accordance with the conditions set forth by the department of parks and recreation. All information pertaining to trail requirements shall be shown on tentative parcel or tract maps and the final parcel or tract map prior to final map recordation.

c. In reviewing land divisions, the hearing officer or regional planning commission shall consider input by the Santa Clarita Valley Trails Advisory Committee regarding trail development.

8. Density-controlled Development. Density-controlled development shall be permitted only if each lot or parcel of land contains a net area of at least two acres.

9. Hillside Management. (Reserved).

10. Significant Ridgeline Protection.

a. Ridgelines are defined as the line formed by the meeting of the tops of sloping surfaces of land. Significant ridgelines are ridgelines which, in general, are highly visible and dominate the landscape. The locations of the significant ridgelines within this CSD are shown on the map following this section and the criteria used for their designation are provided in the appendix following this section.

b. The highest point of a structure shall be located at least 50 vertical feet and 50 horizontal feet from a significant ridgeline, excluding chimneys, rooftop antennas, amateur radio antennas, and wind energy conversion systems.

c. Any modification to subsection D.10.b shall require a minor conditional use permit, as provided in Section 22.56.085. In approving such permit, the director, hearing officer or regional planning commission shall make the following findings in addition to those required by Section 22.56.090:

i. Alternative sites within the project have been considered and eliminated from consideration due to their physical infeasibility or their potential for substantial habitat damage or destruction; and

ii. The project maintains the maximum view of the applicable significant ridgeline through design features, including but not limited to one or more of the following:

(A). Minimized grading.

(B). Reduced structural height.

(C). Use of shapes, materials, and colors that blend with the surrounding environment.

(D). Use of native drought tolerant landscaping for concealment.

d. The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to the repair or replacement of a damaged or destroyed single family residence or accessory structure that was legally established as of the effective date of the ordinance creating this CSD, provided that such single family residence or accessory structure is built in the same location as the one that was damaged or destroyed and does not exceed 5,000 square feet in floor area.

11. Grading.

a. A conditional use permit, as provided in Part 1 of Chapter 22.56, shall be required for any grading that exceeds 5,000 cubic yards of total cut plus total fill material within any 24-month period. For purposes of computing the 5,000 cubic yard threshold amount, grading necessary to establish a turnaround required by the fire department shall be excluded, but not grading for any private street, right-of-way, or driveway leading to such turnaround.

b. In approving a conditional use permit, the hearing officer or regional planning commission shall make the following findings in addition to those required by Section 22.56.090:

i. The grading will be performed in a manner that minimizes disturbance to the natural landscape and terrain through design features,

including but not limited to the location of building pads in the area of the project site with the least slope and/or near a paved street traveled by the public; and

ii. The grading will be accompanied by other design features that maximize preservation of visual quality and community character, including but not limited to reduced structural height, the use of shapes, materials, and colors that blend with the surrounding environment, and the use of native vegetation for concealment.

12. Manure Storage. Manure shall be stored at least 50 feet away from any well or drainage channel, unless placed in a trash receptacle.

E. Zone-specific Development Standards.

1. Residential and Agricultural Zones.

a. Lot Design. Each new lot or parcel of land created by a land division shall contain a net area of at least two acres.

b. Required Yards.

i. Each lot or parcel of land shall have a required front yard of at least 25 feet in depth;

ii. Each lot or parcel of land shall have a required rear yard of at least 25 feet in depth; and

iii. Each lot or parcel of land shall have required interior side yards of at least 10 feet in depth.

c. Fences. Fences or walls within required front yards may exceed three and one-half feet in height, provided that:

i. Fences or walls shall not exceed six feet in height; and

ii. At least 75 percent of the fence or wall area above three and one-half feet in height shall be open and non-view obscuring. The non-view obscuring area shall be evenly distributed horizontally along the entire length of the fence or wall.

d. Structure Separation. Structures used in connection with the agricultural uses permitted by Section 22.44.120.B shall be located at least 35 feet from any street or highway or any building used or designed for human habitation.

e. Temporary Animal Keeping. Fences for the temporary keeping of animals, including but not limited to pipe corrals, shall be exempt from the provisions of subsections E.1.b and E.1.d, above, provided that:

i. Such fences are located at least five feet from any lot line; and

ii. Such fences do not exceed six feet in height.

2. Other Zones. (Reserved).

F. Area-specific Development Standards.

1. San Francisquito Canyon Creek Area.

a. Intent and Purpose. This area is established to protect the San Francisquito Canyon Creek.

b. Area Boundary. The boundaries of this area are shown on the map following this section.

c. Fences. Fences are prohibited.

d. Outdoor Storage. Outdoor storage is prohibited.

2. (Reserved).

G. Modification of Development Standards.

1. Modification Authorized. Modification of the development standards specified in subsections E.1.b (Required Yards), E.1.c (Fences), and E.1.d (Structure Separation) shall be subject to the procedures specified in this section. Modification of the other development standards in this CSD shall be subject to a variance, as provided in Part 2 of Chapter 22.56.

2. 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 1000 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 1000-foot ownership map drawn to a scale of one inch to one hundred feet 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.

3. Notice.

a. At least 30 calendar days prior to the date a decision is made, the director shall send notice of the pending application by first-class mail to the property owners on the list provided by the applicant.

b. The notice shall describe the development proposal and the request for modification. The notice shall also indicate that individuals may submit written protest to the director within 14 calendar days following the date on the notice and that such written protest shall be based on issues of significance directly related to the application and provide evidence that the request for modification does not meet one or more of the findings identified in subsection G.4.a.

4. Findings.

a. The director shall approve or deny the application pursuant to the principles and standards of Section 22.56.1690 and the following findings:

i. 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

ii. That granting the request for modification will not be materially detrimental to properties or improvements in the area or contrary to the purpose of this CSD, as provided in subsection A.

b. The director shall consider each written protest when making a decision on the application. If he determines written protests are based on issues of significance directly related to the application and provide evidence that the request for modification does not meet one or more of the findings, he may request alterations to the development proposal and/or conditions of approval before making a decision on the application.

c. The director may refer an application to the regional planning commission for consideration in a public hearing. All procedures relative to the public hearing shall be subject to Part 4 of Chapter 22.60. The regional planning commission shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny the application pursuant to the findings identified in subsection G.4.a. The decision of the regional planning commission shall become final and effective on the date of the decision and shall not be subject to further administrative appeal.

5. Decision.

a. Notice.

i. If the director approves or denies the application, or refers the application to the regional planning commission, he shall send notice of the decision by certified mail to the applicant and anyone who submitted a written protest.

ii. If the director approves or denies the application, the notice shall indicate that an appeal may be filed with the regional planning commission within 14 calendar days following the date on the notice.

b. Appeal.

i. An appeal 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 public hearing shall be subject to Part 4 of Chapter 22.60.

ii. The regional planning commission shall approve, conditionally approve, or deny the appeal pursuant to the findings identified in subsection G.4.a. The decision of the regional planning commission shall become final and effective on the date of the decision and shall not be subject to further administrative appeal.

APPENDIX FOR SECTION 22.44.144

SAN FRANCISQUITO CANYON COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT

CRITERIA FOR SIGNIFICANT RIDGELINES

The designation of the significant ridgelines within the San Francisquito Canyon Community Standards District is based on the following criteria:

- Topographic complexity: Ridges that have a significant difference in elevation for the valley or canyon floor. Generally, these ridges can be seen from any location on the valley floor, from a community or neighborhood, or from a public road.
- Near/far contrast: Ridges that are part of a scene that includes a prominent landform in the foreground and a major backdrop ridge with an unbroken skyline. This includes a view into a valley from a public road or viewpoint located at a higher altitude, such as along the valley rim or a pass. This contrast can be experienced viewing an entire panoramic view or a portion of a panoramic view from an elevated point.
- Cultural landmarks: Ridges that frame views of well-known locations, structures, or other places which are considered points of interest within the community or region.
- Uniqueness and character of a specific location: Peaks and their buttressing ridges. This is represented by ridges that frame rocky outcroppings, other unique geological features, and areas of extraordinary natural beauty.
- Existing community boundaries and gateways: Ridges and surrounding terrain that provides the first view of predominately natural, undeveloped land as a traveler emerges in the community. These lands introduce visitors to the visual

experiences they will encounter in the community and gateways include the surrounding ridges that provide a skyline and boundary to the community.

Attachment 5: Environmental Document

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

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT NUMBER: R2008-01199 / RADVT200800007 / RENVT200900021

1. DESCRIPTION: The proposed project consists of a Community Standards District (CSD) zoning ordinance. The objective of the CSD, which would establish additional development standards for properties within the San Francisquito Canyon community, is to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the community's existing development pattern as well as the goals, objectives, and policies of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. The development standards contained within the CSD planning area are oriented towards protecting and enhancing the community's secluded rural, equestrian, and agricultural character as well as its natural features, including ridgelines, significant ecological areas, and flood plains. This is not a development project nor does it propose additional development beyond what is allowed under the existing General Plan and County Zoning Ordinance.

2. LOCATION: San Francisquito Canyon

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: March 12, 2009

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: R2008-01199
CASES: RADVT200800007
RENVT200900021

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

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

C.S. Map Date:	February 19, 2009	**Staff Member:**	Rick Kuo
Thomas Guide:	Pages 4370 & 4460	**USGS Quad:**	Newhall, Warm Springs
Location:	The unincorporated community of San Francisquito Canyon is located approximately 40 miles northwest of the Los Angeles Civic Center. It is bounded by the City of Santa Clarita to the south, the unincorporated community of Castaic to the west, and the Angeles National Forest to the north and east.		
Description of Project:	The proposed project consists of a Community Standards District (CSD) zoning ordinance. The objective of the CSD, which would establish additional development standards for properties within the San Francisquito Canyon community, is to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the community's existing development pattern as well as the goals, objectives, and policies of the Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan. The development standards contained within the CSD planning area are oriented towards protecting and enhancing the community's secluded rural, equestrian, and agricultural character as well as its natural features, including ridgelines, significant ecological areas, and flood plains. This is not a development project nor does it propose additional development beyond what is allowed under the existing General Plan and County Zoning Ordinance.		
Gross Area:	1895 acres (3 square miles)		
Environmental Setting:	The unincorporated community of San Francisquito Canyon is a rural and low-density area located in the western Santa Clarita Valley.		
Zoning:	A-2-2, A-2-2.5, A-2-5, R-1-7000, and O-S.		
General Plan:	N/A		
Community/Area Wide Plan:	Santa Clarita Valley Area Plan (Non-Urban 1, Open Space, National Forest, Hillside Management, Floodway/Floodplain.		

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 Santa Clarita
- ☒ CSU Fullerton
- ☒ SCV Historical Society
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Regional Significance

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

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☒ Fire Department
- ☒ DPW: Traffic & Lighting, Geotechnical & Materials Engineering, Drainage and Grading, Flood Maintenance
- ☒ Public Health

CATEGORY	FACTOR	Pg	Less than Significant Impact/No Impact	Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation	Potentially Significant Impact	Potential Concern
			ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)			
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: *7-Non-Urban Hillside, 8-Other Non-Urban and Agricultural, 9-Non-Urban Open Space, 10-Significant Ecological Areas*

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: March 12, 2009

Approved by: *Mitch Glaser, Supervising Regional Planner* Date: March 12, 2009

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? *The CSD planning area is not located in an active or potentially active fault zone or Seismic Hazards Zone (Los Angeles County Safety Element – Fault Rupture Hazards & Seismicity Map).*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)? *Areas of potential earthquake-induced landslides exist throughout the CSD planning area (State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map – Newhall Quad).*
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? *Most of the CSD planning area is subject to liquefaction (State of California Seismic Hazard Zones Map – Newhall Quad).*
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 CSD zoning ordinance establishes additional development standards within the community of San Francisquito Canyon. Any development that is considered a sensitive use is not being proposed.*
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 CSD 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?
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

The proposed San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will regulate the development of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the community's existing development pattern. CSD requirements for larger lot sizes, larger setbacks and resulting lower population density, and limits on grading should not exacerbate any existing hazards. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address potential geotechnical impacts.

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 in the CSD planning area (Thomas Guide).*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone? *The CSD planning area is 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? *The CSD planning area 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 CSD zoning ordinance. CSD requirements for larger lot sizes and limits on grading should not exacerbate any existing hazards.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? *The proposed project is a CSD zoning ordinance to establish additional development standards and not a development project that would alter the existing drainage pattern of the area.*
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 San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will regulate the development of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the community's existing development pattern. Requirements for larger lot sizes, larger setbacks and resulting lower population density, and limits on grading should not exacerbate any existing hazards, and may help avoid some hazards. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review and building permits from the Department of Public Works to address potential flood impacts.

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)? *The CSD 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? *The proposed CSD area is within Fire Zone 4, but access is generally considered to be adequate.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area? *The proposed project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project. CSD requirements for larger lot sizes and resulting lower population density should not exacerbate any existing hazards. Access will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis as actual development projects are proposed.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water pressure to meet fire flow standards? *Water pressure is generally not a problem in the project area, and the expected reduced density of development should not worsen the situation. However, as individual development projects are 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)? *There are no refineries or explosives manufacturing uses within the CSD area. Any future proposed uses located next to flammables will have to comply with Fire Department standards.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve any dangerous fire hazard use. Requirements for larger lots, larger setbacks and resulting lower population density should not exacerbate any existing hazards, and may help avoid some 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

The proposed San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will not create additional development. It will regulate development, and is expected to reduce the allowed density and intensity, as is appropriate in an area of high fire hazard. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address potential fire hazard impacts 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)? *The community of San Francisquito Canyon is not located near any high noise source.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity? *There are no schools, hospitals, or senior citizen facilities within the CSD area, and the ordinance does not propose any 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 CSD zoning ordinance establishes additional development standards, such as larger lots and building setbacks, within the community of San Francisquito Canyon. Such development standards could reduce ambient noise levels.*
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 CSD zoning ordinance establishes additional development standards, such as larger lots and building setbacks, which could reduce ambient noise levels in the project area.*
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 San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will not create additional development. It will regulate the development by additional development standards such as larger lots and building setbacks to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the rural setting. These standards should not exacerbate, and could improve noise impacts. With no freeways, rail lines or airports, major noise sources are not commonly encountered in the project area, however any future development proposals may require appropriate environmental review to address noise impacts.

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? *Properties in the CSD planning area are served by individual water wells, however, there are no known water quality problems in the community of San Francisquito Canyon. Any future development proposals will be subject to comply with permits issued by the Department of Public Works and corresponding water agency.*
b.	☒	☐	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system? *Properties in the CSD planning area are served by private on-site sewage disposal systems. This project does not propose development with such systems, but any future development proposals will require permits issued by the Department of Public Health.*
	☐	☒	☐	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 CSD zoning ordinance does not involve construction that could significantly impact water quality and runoff. Future development proposals may 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 CSD zoning ordinance does not involve development. Future development could result in runoff and discharges. Proposed development standards, such as larger lots and setbacks, should result in lower population density, and reduced impacts from water runoff. Future development proposals may 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 San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will regulate the development of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the rural environment. Proposed development standards, such as larger lots and setbacks, resulting in lower population density, should reduce impacts on water quality. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address water quality impacts.

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 CSD zoning ordinance establishes additional development standards within the community of San Francisquito. 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? *Development that is considered a sensitive use is not proposed. The project area does not contain schools, hospitals, or parks, and is not near a freeway or heavy industrial use.*
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 CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project that will increase local emissions.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources which create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions? *There are no freeways or heavy industrial uses nearby, and the CSD zoning ordinance does not propose development that will generate obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions. As future development projects are proposed, they may require appropriate review to address air quality impacts.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve any development that would obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans. It establishes additional development standards within the community of San Francisquito Canyon.*
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 that would 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 that would 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

The proposed San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will not create additional development. It will regulate the development by establishing additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the rural environment. There are no freeways or heavy industrial uses nearby, and larger lots and lower density resulting from the CSD zoning ordinance will not adversely impact air quality. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address air quality impacts.

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? *The CSD planning area is located within the San Francisquito Canyon SEA (Los Angeles County 2006 SEA Map).*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements, as development is not proposed. The CSD requires larger lots and setbacks, and preservation of native vegetation, which could have a positive effect on habitat areas.*
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 CSD 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 in the community of San Francisquito Canyon (see attachment), however, the proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve development proposals that would remove these habitats.*
e.	☒	☐	☐	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)? *Oak trees exist in some portions of the planning area. Although the proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve any development, any future proposed development projects 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.)? *There are potentially eleven Federal or State listed sensitive species in the CSD planning area that are considered endangered or threatened. However, the proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve any development that would remove these sensitive species. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address impacts to sensitive species and habitats.*
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 San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the rural environment, including large lots and setbacks, preservation of native vegetation and limits on grading, which could have a positive effect on biota. Although the CSD will not create additional development, any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address biota impacts. Properties will also be subject to the Oak Tree Ordinance and SEA 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? *Some areas of the community 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 community of San Francisquito may contain rock formations that indicate potential paleontological resources, however, development that would impact these rock formations is not proposed. The CSD proposes preservation of natural landforms and limits on grading.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites? *There are no sites on the National Register of Historic Places or California Office of Historic Preservation within the project area. However, any future proposed development projects will be subject to appropriate 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 CSD zoning ordinance does not involve any development that would 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 projects will be subject to appropriate review for paleontological resources.*
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

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

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase I Archaeology Report

The proposed San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will not create development. It will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the rural environment. There are no listed historical sites in the project area, however any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address archaeological, historical, and paleontological impacts. 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 project area is not part of a Mineral Resource Zone. The proposed CSD zoning ordinance establishes additional development standards for the community of San Francisquito Canyon, but will not create development which would affect availability of known mineral resources.*
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? *There are no mineral discovery sites in the project area. The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve any development that would result in the loss of important mineral resource.*
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

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

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

The project area is not part of a Mineral Resource Zone. The proposed CSD zoning ordinance establishes additional development standards for the community of San Francisquito Canyon, but will not create development which would affect availability of known mineral resources. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address impacts 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? *The community of San Francisquito Canyon does not contain any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (California Department of Conservation 2006 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map).*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act Contract? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or the Williamson 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 community of San Francisquito Canyon does not contain any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (California Department of Conservation 2006 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map).*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Other factors? *The proposed CSD planning area contains Grazing Land, however, its use will not be affected by the project.*

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

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

The proposed San Francisquito CSD zoning ordinance will not create additional development, but will regulate any future proposed development proposals. It will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the rural environment, including agricultural land uses.

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 are no scenic highways or corridors in the community of San Francisquito Canyon.*
b.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? *Cliffie Stone Trail and Lady Linda Loop Trail are located in the CSD planning area. However, the project does not propose development which would obstruct views, and proposed standards such as larger lots and setbacks should reduce the visual impacts of any future proposed development.*
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area, which contains unique aesthetic features? *Portions of the planning area are undeveloped, with scenic features, including the Angeles National Forest lands and ridgelines.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not propose any development or changes in land use beyond what is currently allowed. Proposed standards will help protect and preserve the rural character.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not propose any development. It establishes additional development standards such as larger lots and building setbacks which will reduce potential 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

The proposed San Francisquito CSD zoning ordinance will not create additional development, but will regulate any future proposed development, to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the community's rural character, including visual impacts, through standards for such as larger lots and building setbacks. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address visual quality impacts.

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 project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project involving dwelling units. There are no significant congestion problems in the area.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve development that will result in any hazardous traffic conditions. It establishes development standards for the San Francisquito Canyon community.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not create development. It establishes development standards for the community of San Francisquito Canyon, but does not change standards which affect parking or traffic.*
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 CSD zoning ordinance does not create any development. Standards such as minimum required road widths will improve emergency access. Any future development projects 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 CSD zoning ordinance does not involve development beyond what is currently allowed that will exceed CMP Transportation Impact Analysis thresholds.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? *The proposed project is a CSD zoning ordinance that would not propose uses that will 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 San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will not create additional development, but will regulate any future proposed development. It will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the community's rural character. Standards such as larger lots and building setbacks will result in lower density and potentially positive effect on traffic. However, any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address traffic and access impacts.

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 project area is not served by public or community sewage systems. Any future development projects will require appropriate review to address sewage impacts.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site? *The project area is not served by public or community sewage systems. Any future development projects will require appropriate review to address sewage impacts.*
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 project area is not served by public or community sewage systems. The proposed San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will not create additional development, but will regulate the development in the future. It will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the rural environment. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address sewage impacts.

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 project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project that could create school capacity problems at the district level.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools which will serve the project site? *The proposed project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project that could create capacity at individual schools.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems? *The proposed project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project that could create student transportation problems.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand? *The proposed project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project that could 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 San Francisquito CSD zoning ordinance will regulate the development of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the rural environment, including larger lots and building setbacks, which will reduce population density and potential school and library impacts. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address impacts relating to school and library capacity, and will be subject to school and library impact fees.

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 project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project that could create staffing or response time problems at the Santa Clarita Valley Sheriff's Station, which serves the CSD planning area.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area? *The project is located in a high fire severity zone (Zone 4), and is served by the Los Angeles County Fire Station #156. However, the proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve any development that could worsen fire or law enforcement problems.*
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

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

☐ Fire Mitigation Fees

The proposed San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will regulate the development of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It will establish additional development standards such as larger lots and building setbacks which will tend to reduce population and building density. However, future development proposals will require appropriate review to address impacts 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? *The CSD planning area is served by individual water wells. Water supply is generally adequate.*
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 are generally adequate for fire flow standards.*
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. It establishes additional development standards such as larger lots and building setbacks, which may reduce population density and demand for utility services.*
d.	☐	☐	☒	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)? *The project does not propose any development. Landfill capacity is challenged across the region, but the proposed additional development standards such as larger lots and building setbacks, may reduce population density and demand for such services.*
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 CSD zoning ordinance does not propose any development. Standards such as larger lots may result in a more dispersed population, but also a smaller population.*
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 San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will regulate the development of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the community's existing development pattern. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address utility and other service impacts.

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 project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project that would propose uses resulting in 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 CSD zoning ordinance intends to preserve the rural patterns, scale, and character of the community.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land? *The community of San Francisquito Canyon does not contain any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, and the project does not propose to reduce or convert agricultural land to other uses.*
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 San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will regulate the development of what is currently allowed by the zoning code and will not create additional development. It will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the community's existing development pattern. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address impacts 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? *There are no major industrial uses in the project area, and the proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not involve development projects that will 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 proposed CSD zoning ordinance does not propose development projects that use pressurized tanks or store hazardous wastes on-site.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected? *There are residences throughout the project area, however, the proposed CSD zoning ordinance will not cause a negative impact to these uses.*
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 major industrial or commercial uses in the CSD planning area, and no known residual soil toxicity or groundwater contamination.*
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 project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development that would 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 project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project that would 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? *The project area 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 project area 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 proposed project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project that would 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 San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will not create additional development. The project creates additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the rural environment and residential character of the community. Increased lot sizes and building setbacks will not negatively affect environmental safety, and may improve it.

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 CSD zoning ordinance establishes additional development standards, applicable within the existing zoning and land use classifications.*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance establishes additional development standards, applicable within the existing zoning and land use classifications.*
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 project is a CSD zoning ordinance and not a development project that would propose uses to physically divide the San Francisquito Canyon community.*
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the community's existing development pattern. Other parts of the zoning code, such as Hillside Management and SEA regulations will apply as before. Any future development proposals will require appropriate 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 project does not propose any development, and proposed development standards such as larger lot sizes and building setbacks may have the effect of reducing 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 project does not propose any development, and proposed development standards such as larger lot sizes and building setbacks may have the effect of reducing population growth.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance establishes development standards for the community of San Francisquito Canyon. Development is not being proposed, nor would standards be applied to existing development.*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project result in a substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)? *The project does not propose development. Standards proposed may result in less development, which would result in less population and less VMT.*
e.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents? *The proposed development standards may reduce the current level of housing allowed. Future development when proposed may be subject to Quimby fees for park facilities.*
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? *The proposed CSD zoning ordinance establishes development standards for the community of San Francisquito Canyon. Development is not being proposed, nor would standards be applied to existing development.*
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors? *N/A*

☐ MITIGATION MEASURES / ☒ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed San Francisquito Canyon CSD zoning ordinance will not create additional development, but will establish additional development standards to ensure that future public and private improvements are consistent with the rural environment. Proposed standards such as larger lot sizes and building setbacks may reduce the level of future population and density. Standards will not cause displacement, or induce growth. Any future development proposals will require appropriate review to address population, employment, and recreation impacts.

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

SAN FRANCISQUITO CANYON COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT (CSD):
The objective of the CSD is to establish new development standards that are intended to maintain the low density, rural character, and significant natural resources of the community of San Francisquito Canyon.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles has recommended approval of an ordinance to establish a Community Standards District (CSD) for the unincorporated community of San Francisquito Canyon.

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. Rick Kuo at (213) 974-6476 between 7:30 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday or e-mail him at *rkuo@planning.lacounty.gov*. Project materials will also be available on the Department of Regional Planning website at http://planning.lacounty.gov/ord/pending.

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