CLICK HERE FOR LETTER

CLICK HERE FOR DIRECTOR OF PLANNING MEMO DATE 07/15/04 & SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Los Angeles County
Department of Regional Planning

Planning for the Challenges Ahead

James E. Hartl, AICP
Director of Planning

February 10, 2004

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

Dear Supervisors:

HEARING ON AMENDMENTS TO COUNTY CODE TITLE 22 (PLANNING AND ZONING) TO AMEND THE ROWLAND HEIGHTS COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT ("CSD") (1ST AND 4TH SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICTS) (3-VOTES)

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

1. Consider the attached Negative Declaration, previously adopted by your Board on November 27, 2001 when the original Rowland Heights CSD was adopted, and find that there is no substantial evidence that the amendment will have a significant effect on the environment;

2. Approve the recommendation of the Regional Planning Commission ("Commission") to adopt an amendment to the Rowland Heights CSD that establishes specific development standards and project review procedures for projects in commercial and industrial zones;

3. Find that adoption of the proposed amendment is de minimus in its effect on fish and wildlife resources, and authorize the Director of Planning to complete and file a Certificate of Fee Exemption for the project;

4. Adopt an ordinance, substantially similar to the draft ordinance attached hereto, approved as to form by County Counsel, with those changes your Board deems necessary upon your consideration of public testimony and supplemental information submitted by the Director of Planning pursuant to an order of the Commission, and determine that it is compatible with and supportive of the goals and policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan. The ordinance amends Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code; and

5. Repeal Interim Ordinance No. 2003-0025U, which temporarily regulates the use of commercially zoned property in the community of Rowland Heights, upon the

effective date of this ordinance. The interim ordinance was adopted on April 29, 2003 and extended on June 10, 2003.

PURPOSE OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

At the request of members of the Rowland Heights community and your Board, the Department of Regional Planning ("Department") developed the amendment to the Rowland Heights CSD. The objective of the proposed amendment is to establish revised development standards and review procedures for all development in commercial zones, and commercial development in industrial zones. This amendment was developed in response to concerns raised by residents in the area regarding traffic and neighborhood compatibility of commercial development in Rowland Heights.

The new development standards include revised setbacks and landscaping requirements, maximum lot coverage, a floor-area ratio, a dedicated acceleration/deceleration lane for certain commercial development, and certain architectural standards. The standard of review for the revised review procedures depends on the number of net daily vehicle trips generated by the use and whether the proposed development involves a change or intensification of use where no additional floor area is added to an existing structure. The amendment potentially increases the number of development projects that are subject to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and provides for consideration of potential mitigation of the environmental impacts (e.g. traffic, neighborhood compatibility, etc.) of commercial development.

The Commission requested that the impacts of the development standards approved during the January 28, 2004 public hearing, as well as other minor issues, be evaluated by staff prior to consideration of the CSD by your Board. These issues include a review of how smaller properties in Rowland Heights would be affected by the provisions of the CSD amendment. Staff is currently researching the concerns raised by the Commission and will provide supplemental information to your Board prior to the public hearing.

JUSTIFICATION

The Board of Supervisors directed the Department to conduct a study of commercially zoned properties in the Rowland Heights area to analyze the potential for further development or intensification of the commercial areas in the community. Members of the community had voiced their concerns regarding the recent construction of several dense commercial shopping centers and the impacts of these developments on the surrounding community and traffic levels. The study concluded that potential further development was possible in commercial zones. As a result of this conclusion, staff drafted an amendment to the Rowland Heights CSD.

The study was conducted and made public in February, 2003. Since that time staff has revisited the study's findings and has also considered the potential commercial development of industrially zoned properties. In addition to several small commercially

zoned vacant properties, there are two large 14 acre properties which are currently either vacant or significantly underutilized. One of these parcels is commercially zoned, the other is industrially zoned. Although no plans have yet been submitted, staff is aware that commercial developments of significant size are intended for the properties.

A community plan for Rowland Heights was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1981. The CSD amendment satisfies several of the primary goals mentioned in the Plan, such as:

- Maintaining the single-family character of the community;
- Improving traffic circulation;
- Balancing projected growth and development with environmental considerations; and
- Beautifying commercial areas and highways.

At the time the community plan was adopted, the community regarded growth and the increase in density as the most critical issues. Specifically, the concern at that time was that the area maintain a single-family character and that the hillside areas be protected. Today, most level areas and less steep hillside areas of the community are developed.

Over the past decade, the challenge facing Rowland Heights was to maintain standards that preserve the character of the community. To address this concern, your Board adopted the Rowland Heights CSD on November 27, 2001, and subsequently amended it on September 24, 2002 to address recreational vehicle standards.

Even after the CSD was adopted, concerns were repeatedly raised by community members regarding the appearance of commercial areas, levels of traffic congestion throughout the community, and methods to lessen some of the negative impacts of development. These repeated concerns led staff to revisit the CSD. As a result, an urgency ordinance was developed, requiring a conditional use permit (CUP) for development in commercial zones that exceed specified thresholds. The urgency ordinance was adopted by the Board on April 29, 2003 and extended on June 10, 2003. The urgency ordinance will expire on April 27, 2004, unless extended.

Numerous community meetings and public hearings were held to gain feedback from the public. Staff received comments both in support of and in opposition to the proposed CSD amendment. On February 27, 2003, staff proposed the CSD amendment at a community meeting. The community members who attended the meeting were supportive of the amendment. As a result of the positive feedback, the Commission approved the amendment, with minor revisions, at the May 28, 2003 public hearing. However, on June 10, 2003, your Board held a public hearing to extend the urgency ordinance originally adopted on April 29, 2003. At that time, several people testified in opposition to the urgency ordinance. Your Board adopted the urgency ordinance extension, but requested that the Commission reopen the hearing on the CSD amendment and that staff meet with community members in opposition to the CSD amendment.

As a result of differing viewpoints from the Rowland Heights residential and business communities, staff developed various alternatives to the original CSD amendment. As it was originally approved, the CSD amendment contained thresholds relating to new construction or change/intensification of use. Also, new buildings or additions to buildings required a CUP based on building square footage and the number of stories. A change/intensification of use required a CUP based on a percentage increase in the occupancy load of the structure.

In response to concerns raised about the cost and length of time required to obtain a CUP, staff revised the original CSD amendment and developed a three-tiered approach for development projects. These tiers were based on square footage thresholds and required a Director's Review for small projects, a Minor CUP for medium-sized projects, and a regular CUP for larger-sized projects. This alternative was discussed at the June 25, 2003 community meeting, and the July 23, 2003 and August 11, 2003 public hearings. As requested by the Commission, further revisions were then made to the CSD amendment to: 1) base review thresholds on net daily vehicle trips generated by use rather than on square footage; and 2) require additional development standards to regulate building placement and bulk. The CSD amendment was then approved by the Commission on September 24, 2003.

After staff obtained additional information about possible alternative review procedures, the Commission reopened the public hearing and requested that staff hold another community meeting. Two alternative versions of the CSD were presented at the January 7, 2004 community meeting. In the alternatives, the minor CUP process was replaced with a discretionary director's review process. These alternatives were presented at the January 28, 2004 public hearing where staff recommended the alternative version with a discretionary director's review process. The Commission approved staff's recommendation.

IMPLEMENTATION OF COUNTYWIDE STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The proposed amendments promote the County's strategic plan goal of "service excellence" and "organizational effectiveness" by developing clear and reasonable development standards for the Rowland Heights community in response to community concerns.

FISCAL IMPACT

Implementation of the proposed amendments will not result in any significant new costs to the Department or other County departments nor in any loss of revenue to the County. Adoption of these amendments will not result in the need for additional departmental staffing.

FINANCING

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

FACTS AND PROVISIONAL/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The proposed CSD amendment was subject to citizen review at three public meetings held in Rowland Heights, one at Rowland High School on February 27, 2003 and the other two at Alvarado Intermediate School on June 25, 2003 and January 7, 2004, respectively. At the public meetings many community members expressed concerns regarding traffic congestion, traffic safety, and the aesthetics of the commercial areas in Rowland Heights. They also expressed their support for increased regulation of commercial development. Not all meeting attendees were in favor of the proposed CSD amendment. In particular, many attendees voiced concerns about the economic impact of the recommended review procedures for projects in commercial and industrial zones. Other attendees raised concerns about their ability to meet the recommended development standards.

The Commission conducted public hearings regarding this matter on May 28, 2003, July 23, 2003, August 11, 2003, September 24, 2003, and January 28, 2004. To encourage participation from the public and to make attendance at the public hearing more convenient, the Commission held the August 11, 2003 hearing in the evening at Alvarado Intermediate School in Rowland Heights. At the hearings, the Commission heard testimony in support of and in opposition to the proposed amendments. On January 28, 2004 the Commission recommended approval of the amendment to the Rowland Heights CSD.

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

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

Approval of the proposed amendments will not have an impact on County services.

NEGATIVE DECLARATION/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The proposed amendment constitutes a regulatory action that will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment. The attached Negative Declaration, previously adopted by your Board on November 27, 2001, when the original Rowland Heights CSD was adopted, shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before your Board, that the adoption of the proposed amendments will have a significant effect on the environment.

Respectfully submitted,

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

James E. Hartl, AICP
Director of Planning

JEH:JTM:AA

Attachments:

1. Resolution of the Planning Commission
2. Project Summary
3. Recommended Amendment to the Ordinance for Board Adoption
4. Negative Declaration/Initial Study Adopted November 27, 2001
5. Summary of RPC Proceedings
6. Legal Notice of Board Hearing
7. List of Persons to be Notified

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

RESOLUTION

THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

WHEREAS, on May 28, 2003 the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles ("Commission") has conducted a public hearing regarding amending Title 22 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Los Angeles County Code to amend the Rowland Heights Community Standards District ("CSD"). The Commission further considered the subject amendment on July 23, 2003, August 11, 2003, September 24, 2003, and January 28, 2004.

WHEREAS, the Commission finds as follows:

1. The Rowland Heights area is located on the northern side of the Puente and Chino Hills and primarily south of the Pomona Freeway. The community boundary extends from the City of Industry to the north, to Orange County to the south. The City of Diamond Bar forms the eastern boundary. The western boundary consists of the unincorporated community of Hacienda Heights and the City of La Habra Heights.

2. Rowland Heights is divided between the First and Fourth Supervisorial Districts. The majority of the land is located within the Fourth District, but the area north of Colima Road between Nogales Street and the City of Industry boundary is within the First District.

3. The community has been developed primarily with residential uses in zones R-1 (Single- Family Residence), R-2 (Two-Family Residence), R-3 (Limited Multiple Residence), R-4-30U (Unlimited Residence, 30 dwelling units/acre), R-A (Residential Agriculture), A-1 (Light Agriculture, and A-2 (Heavy Agriculture). Commercial uses are located along the major arterial streets and are zoned C-1 (Restricted Business), C-2 (Neighborhood Business), C-3 (Unlimited Commercial), C-R (Commercial Recreation), and CPD (Commercial Planned Development). Some industrial land zoned M-1 (Light Manufacturing) and M-1½ (Restricted Heavy Manufacturing) is located in the northern area of the community along the Pomona Freeway. The majority of land that is undeveloped is steeply sloping, zoned A-1, A-2, and O-S (Open Space), and located within the Tonner and Powder Canyon Significant Ecological Areas. There are also some vacant properties in the commercial corridor along Colima Road, as well as a large vacant property north of the Pomona Freeway that is industrially zoned.

4. A community plan for Rowland Heights was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 1981. The Rowland Heights Community Standards District (CSD) was adopted on November 27, 2001 and subsequently amended on September 24, 2002. An urgency ordinance requiring a conditional use

permit for development in commercial zones that exceed the prescribed thresholds is currently in effect. The urgency ordinance was adopted by the Board on April 29, 2003 and extended on June 10, 2003. The urgency ordinance will expire on April 27, 2004 if it is not extended.

5. The proposed CSD amendment will establish new development standards for setbacks and landscaping, maximum lot coverage and floor-area ratio, a dedicated acceleration/deceleration lane for certain commercial development, and architectural features. It also establishes a discretionary director's review or conditional use permit requirement for commercial development in commercial and industrial zones. The standard of review depends on the net number of daily vehicle trips generated by the use and whether the proposed development involves a change or intensification of use where no additional floor area is added to an existing structure. The amendment will also provide for consideration of potential mitigation of the traffic impacts of commercial development.

6. The proposed standards will help implement the Rowland Heights Community Plan goals to "beautify commercial areas and highways," "improve traffic circulation," and "balance projected growth and development with environmental considerations."

7. The proposed CSD amendment was subject to citizen review at three public meetings held in Rowland Heights, one at Rowland High School on February 27, 2003 and the other two at Alvarado Intermediate School on June 25, 2003 and January 7, 2004. At the public meetings many community members expressed concerns regarding traffic congestion, traffic safety, the aesthetics of the commercial areas in Rowland Heights. The also expressed their support for increased regulation of commercial development.

8. An initial study was prepared for the establishment of the Rowland Heights CSD in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). The initial study showed that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the County, that the amendment to the Zoning Code may have a significant effect on the environment. Based on the initial study, the Department of Regional Planning prepared a Negative Declaration which was approved by the Board of Supervisors on November 27, 2001. Since there is no substantial change in environmental impacts of the proposed amendment to the Rowland Heights CSD, and because individual projects, as they are proposed, will undergo appropriate reviews to assess potential environmental impacts, the prior determination of Negative Declaration still applies.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Commission recommends to the Board of Supervisors ("Board") of the County of Los Angeles as follows:

1. That the Board hold a public hearing to consider the proposed amendments to Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code (the Zoning Ordinance) related to amending the Rowland Heights Community Standards District;

2. That the Board find that the proposed amendment to the Rowland Heights Community Standards District will not have a significant effect on the environment;

3. That the Board find that the adoption of the proposed amendment is *de minimus* in its effect on fish and wildlife resources, and authorize the Director of Planning to complete and file a Certificate of Fee Exemption for the project; and

4. That the Board adopt an ordinance containing modifications to Title 22 (the Zoning Ordinance) as recommended by this Commission, and determine that they are compatible with, and supportive of the goals and policies of the Los Angeles County General Plan.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by a majority of the members of the Regional Planning Commission of the County of Los Angeles on January 28, 2004.

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

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

PROJECT SUMMARY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:	Proposed amendments to Title 22 (Planning and Zoning) to amend the Rowland Heights Community Standards District ("CSD") to include development standards and review procedures applicable to commercial and industrial zones.
REQUEST:	Approve the Rowland Heights CSD amendment.
LOCATION:	The unincorporated community of Rowland Heights.
APPLICANT:	Department of Regional Planning
STAFF CONTACT:	Julie Moore at (213) 974-6425.
RPC HEARING DATE:	May 28, 2003; July 23, 2003; August 11, 2003; September 24, 2003; January 28, 2004
RPC RECOMMENDATION:	Board hearing and approval of proposed amendments.
MEMBERS VOTING AYE:	Bellamy, Valadez, Rew, and Modugno
MEMBERS VOTING NO:	None
MEMBERS ABSTAINING:	None
MEMBERS ABSENT:	Helsley
KEY ISSSUES:	Proposed CSD amendment establishes revised development standards for development in commercial zones and commercial development in industrial zones. These standards include increased setbacks and landscaping, maximum lot coverage, a floor-area ratio, a dedicated acceleration/deceleration lane for certain commercial development, and architectural features. The project review procedures, based on vehicle trip generation, provide for consideration of potential mitigation of the impacts (e.g. traffic, neighborhood compatibility, etc.) of development.
MAJOR POINTS IN FAVOR:	The CSD amendment addresses land use issues

identified by the community, and would have a positive effect on the residents' quality of life by regulating development of commercially and industrially zoned properties based on traffic generation. By requiring new development to comply with additional revised development standards, the community's appearance will be improved. Impacts of future development will also be taken into consideration through the revised project review procedures which include review of environmental impacts under CEQA provisions. This process allows for the imposition of possible mitigation measures. The ministerial director's review process that these projects currently undergo does not clearly provide for consideration of project impacts or for environmental review of a project.

MAJOR POINTS AGAINST:

Concerns raised at the community meetings and public hearings regarding the impacts of the CSD amendment include the following: 1) the new standards will unfairly restrict commercial development; 2) the already high commercial rental/lease rates in the area will rise further because of restrictions to commercial development affecting small business owners; 3) the problem of traffic congestion in Rowland Heights is a regional problem and needs to be addresses through large-scale regional plans; 4) the CUP process is lengthy and costs are prohibitive; 5) the new standards may deter future development and negatively impact the economic prosperity of the community.

ORDINANCE NO._____

An ordinance amending Title 22 – Planning and Zoning of the Los Angeles County Code to amend the Rowland Heights Community Standards District.

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

SECTION 1. Section 22.44.132 is hereby amended to read as follows:

22.44.132 Rowland Heights Community Standards District.

A. Intent and Purpose. The Rowland Heights Community Standards District is established to implement the Rowland Heights Community Plan, adopted by the Board of Supervisors on September 1, 1981, and to address the needs of residential property owners who are unable to comply with the restrictions contained in Section 22.20.025 in the keeping or parking of recreational vehicles on their lots, due to the prevailing size, shape, topography, and development of residential lots in the area. The Rowland Heights Community Standards District establishes development standards (1) to ensure that new development retains the residential character of the area, that the appearance of signs in commercial areas is appropriate for the community, and that increased landscaping requirements, ~~and~~ building setbacks, and commercial development standards and review processes are implemented to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the community; and (2) to allow for the keeping and parking of recreational vehicles on residentially and agriculturally zoned lots in a manner that protects the health, safety, and general welfare of the entire community.

B. Description of District. The boundaries of the District are coterminous with the boundaries of the Rowland Heights Community Plan. The District boundary extends from the City of Industry on the north to Orange County on the south; the City of

Diamond Bar forms the eastern boundary, while the western boundaries consist of Hacienda Heights and the City of La Habra Heights. The Pomona Freeway, Brea Canyon Road, Fullerton Road south of Pathfinder Road, Colima Road west of Stoner Creek Road, and the Schabarum Regional Park conform to the approximate boundaries of the District. The map of the District follows this section.

C. Community-Wide Development Standards. All properties shall be neatly maintained, and yard areas that are visible from the street shall be free of debris, trash, lumber, overgrown or dead vegetation, broken or discarded furniture, and household equipment such as refrigerators, stoves, and freezers.

D. Zone-Specific Development Standards.

1. Zones A-1, A-2, R-1, and R-A.

a. Front yard landscaping. A minimum of 50 percent of the required front yard area shall contain landscaping consisting of grass, shrubs, trees, and other similar plant materials. Paved or all-gravel surfaces may not be included as part of the required landscaped area.

b. Trash containers and dumpsters stored in the front or side yard areas shall be screened from view from streets, walkways, and adjacent residences.

2. Zone C-1.

a. Modification of the following development standards shall be subject to a minor variation, as provided in subsection D.6 of this section.

i. Signs. Except as herein modified, all signs shall conform to Part 10 of Chapter 22.52.

a. (A) Roof signs shall be prohibited.

~~b.~~ (B) Freestanding Business Signs.

~~i.~~ (1) Freestanding business signs shall be permitted on any lot or parcel of land for each street frontage having a continuous distance of 100 feet or more.

~~ii.~~ (2) The maximum height of a freestanding business sign shall be 20 feet.

~~iii.~~ (3) The total sign area of a freestanding business sign shall not exceed 40 square feet per sign face plus one-fourth square foot of sign area for each one foot of street or highway frontage in excess of 100 feet.

~~iv.~~ (4) Freestanding business signs shall not be located in nor extend above any public right-of-way, including sidewalk areas.

~~c.~~ (C) Business signs.

~~i.~~ (1) Wall business signs shall be limited to one square foot for each linear foot of building frontage.

~~ii.~~ (2) To facilitate the identification or location of the premises in cases of emergency and for other public health, safety, and welfare purposes, business signs readable from a public right-of-way or parking area open to the general public shall include the following information on the sign:

Street address and name of the business, using Roman alphabet characters and Arabic numerals, in digits which are readable from the right-of-way or parking area.

~~d.~~ (D) Awning signs. The total area of awning signs shall not exceed 25 percent of the exterior surface of each awning for the ground floor and 15 percent of the exterior surface of each awning for the second floor level.

~~e.~~ (E) Sign programs for commercial centers.

~~i.~~ (1) The owner or operator of a commercial center consisting of three or more businesses shall submit a sign program to the director to coordinate business signage within the commercial center. No new business sign shall be installed until the required sign program has been approved by the director.

~~ii.~~ (2) The sign program shall illustrate locations, styles, and standards for potential business signs within the commercial center.

~~iii.~~ (3) All new signs shall conform to the specifications set forth in the approved sign program.

~~iv.~~ (4) Existing signs that are inconsistent with the approved sign program shall be replaced within five years of the approval of the sign program.

ii. Parking Lot Landscaping. Except for rooftop or interior parking, an existing or proposed parking lot with 20 or more parking spaces shall have a minimum of five percent of the gross area of the parking lot landscaped. Landscaping shall be distributed throughout the parking lot to maximize the aesthetic effect and compatibility with adjoining uses. Where appropriate, all areas of the parking lot not used for vehicle parking or maneuvering or for pedestrian movement or activity shall be landscaped.

b. Modification of the following development standards shall be subject to a variance, as provided in Part 2 of Chapter 22.56.

i. Setbacks. The minimum required setback for new structures or additions shall be 20 feet from the property line(s) along those portions of the property where there is street frontage. The 10 feet of the setback area closest to the street shall

be landscaped in a manner described in subsection D.2.b.ii below. Any building that exceeds 20 feet in height, excluding chimneys and rooftop antennas, shall be setback a minimum of 35 feet from the property line(s) along those portions of the property having street frontage.

ii. Landscaping. A minimum of 15 percent of the net lot area shall be landscaped with a lawn, shrubbery, flowers and/or trees for properties less than one acre in area and a minimum of 10 percent of net lot area shall be landscaped for properties one acre or more in area. The landscaping shall be maintained with regular pruning, weeding, fertilizing, litter removal, and replacement of plants when necessary. Incidental walkways, if needed, may be developed in the landscaped area.

iii. Buffers. A minimum setback of three feet from any property line adjoining a residential zone is required for new structures or additions. For such structures over 15 feet in height, the setback shall be increased by one foot for each additional foot of building height over 15 feet.

iv. Lot Coverage. The maximum lot coverage shall be 33 percent of the net lot area.

v. Floor-Area Ratio. The floor-area ratio (FAR) for all buildings on a parcel of land shall not exceed 0.5. Cellar floor space, parking floor space with necessary interior driveways and ramps thereto, or space within a roof structure penthouse for the housing of operating equipment or machinery shall not be included in determining the floor-area ratio.

vi. Architectural Features. At least 25 percent of the building façade, facing a street or a residential zone, shall be differentiated by recessed

windows, offset planes, or other similar architectural details. Long, unbroken façades are prohibited.

vii. Deceleration/Acceleration Lane. A dedicated deceleration/acceleration lane shall be provided where a parcel has 600 feet or more of street frontage, such lane shall be designed, dedicated, and improved subject to the requirements of the Department of Public Works.

viii. Nonconforming Buildings and Structures. Buildings and structures which are not in conformance with the standards as contained in subsection D.2 of this section may be continued subject to the conditions contained in Part 10 of Chapter 22.56.

c. Review of Projects.

i. Construction of building(s), addition(s) to existing building(s), or a change or intensification of use whose requested use generates less than 500 net daily vehicle trips shall require a ministerial director's review as described in subsection D.2.d.

ii. A change or intensification of use where no additional floor area is added to an existing structure and that generates 500 or more net daily vehicle trips shall require a discretionary director's review as described in subsection D.2.e.

iii. Construction of building(s) and addition(s) to existing building(s) where additional floor area is added whose requested use generates 500 or more net daily vehicle trips shall require a conditional use permit as described in subsection D.2.f.

iv. Determination of Net Daily Vehicle Trips.

(A) For purposes of this section, net daily vehicle trips means the difference between the number of daily vehicle trips generated by a proposed use and the number of daily vehicle trips generated by the previous use which existed on the site.

(B) The number of net daily vehicle trips shall be determined by the director of planning in accordance with the trip generation standards published and periodically updated by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, in consultation with the Department of Public Works.

(C) Uses not specified. Where trip generation standards for any use are not specified in the trip generation standards published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, the net daily vehicle trips shall be based upon the standards for the most comparable use as determined by the director of planning in consultation with the Department of Public Works.

(D) The net daily vehicle trips shall be calculated by subtracting the daily vehicle trips for the previous or existing use on the site from the daily vehicle trips for the proposed use, as determined by the director of planning in consultation with the Department of Public Works. A use which has been vacant for two or more years shall be deemed to have a daily trip count of zero.

d. Ministerial Director's Review. Projects as described in subsection D.2.c.i of this section shall require a ministerial director's review as provided in Part 12 of Chapter 22.56 in compliance with the principles and standards described in Section 22.56.1690.A.

e. Discretionary Director's Review. Projects as described in subsection D.2.c.ii of this section shall require a discretionary director's review , as provided in Part 12 of Chapter 22.56 and in compliance with the principles and standards described in Section 22.56.1690.B. In addition, the discretionary director's review shall be subject to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Division 13, and shall undergo an environmental review. Conditions may be imposed for purposes of mitigating impacts relating to avoidance of traffic congestion, prevention of adverse effects on neighboring properties, or other such considerations. In addition to the procedures described in Part 12 of Chapter 22.56, the following shall also be required:

i. Application materials. The following application materials shall be submitted by the applicant:

(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 a distance of 200 feet from the exterior boundaries of the subject property;

(B) Two sets of completed mailing labels for the above-stated owners; and

(C) A map drawn to a scale specified by the director indicating where all such ownerships are located.

ii. Application fee. When an application for a discretionary director's review is filed, it shall be accompanied by the filing fee as set forth in Section

22.60.100 of this code, equal to that required for a site plan review for commercial and industrial projects over 20,000 square feet in size and any related environmental review fee as set forth in Section 12.04.020 of Title 12.

iii. Notification that an application has been filed. Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 22.56.1730, the director shall send notice of a request for a discretionary director's review site plan to all persons shown on the list required by subsection D.2.e.i(A) and such other persons whose property might in the director's judgment be affected by such project, including but not limited to homeowners associations and civic organizations. The notice shall describe the project and inform the recipient that written comments for consideration may be submitted to the director within 20 days of receipt of the notice by the applicant.

iv. Notification of decision. Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 22.56.1730, the director shall notify the applicant, persons who submitted written comments, and other persons requesting notification, including but not limited to homeowners associations and civic organizations, of the decision made by the director on the application, by first class mail, postage prepaid, or other means deemed appropriate by the director.

v. Calls for review. Decisions of the director on discretionary director's review applications may be called up for review by the commission according to the calls-for-review provisions of Sections 22.60.220, 22.60.230, 22.60.240, and 22.60.260. The decision of the commission shall be final.

vi. Rights of appeal. Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 22.56.1750, any person dissatisfied with the action of the director may file an appeal

from such action. Such appeal shall be filed with the commission within 20 days following notification of receipt of the notice of decision by the applicant. The decision of the commission shall be final. The appeal filing requirements, procedures, and effective dates shall be in accordance with the provisions of Sections 22.60.220, 22.60.230, 22.60.240, and 22.60.260.

vii. Effective Dates.

(A) Notwithstanding the requirements of Section 22.56.1750, the decision of the director shall become effective 20 days after receipt of the notice of decision by the applicant, unless appealed to or called up for review by the commission prior to that date.

(B) The decision of the commission shall become effective on the date of the commission's action. A notice of decision shall be sent pursuant to subsection D.2.e.iv of this section.

f. Conditional use permit. Projects as described in subsection D.2.c.iii of this section shall require a conditional use permit as provided in Part 1 of Chapter 22.56.

3. Zone C-2.

a. The standards, review and permit provisions prescribed for Zone C-1, as contained in subsection D.2, shall apply to Zone C-2 with the exception of the sign area of freestanding business signs as specified in subsection D.2.~~b~~.a.~~iii.~~i(B)(3).

b. Freestanding Signs. The total sign area of a freestanding sign shall not exceed 80 square feet per sign face plus three-fourth square foot of sign area for each one foot of street or highway frontage in excess of 100 feet.

~~c. Where a parking lot containing more than 20 parking spaces exists or is proposed, at least 5 percent of the gross area of the parking lot shall be landscaped. Landscaping shall be distributed throughout the parking lot to maximize the aesthetic effect and compatibility with adjoining uses. Where appropriate, all areas of the parking lot not used for vehicle parking or maneuvering or for pedestrian movement or activity shall be landscaped. This subsection shall not apply to a parking lot within or on the roof of a building.~~

~~d. The minimum required setback for new structures or additions shall be ten feet from the property line(s) along those portions of the property where there is street frontage. The ten feet of the setback area closest to the street shall be landscaped in accordance with an approved site plan.~~

~~e. A minimum setback of three feet from any property line adjoining a residential zone is required for new structures or additions. For such structures over 15 feet in height, the setback shall be increased by one foot for each additional foot of building height over 15 feet.~~

4. Zone C-3.

a. The standards, review and permit provisions prescribed for Zone C-2, as contained in subsection D.3, shall apply to Zone C-3.

b. Building Height. A building or structure shall not exceed a height of 45 feet above grade, excluding chimneys and rooftop antennas.

5. Zones M-1 and M-1½. For every lot or parcel of land in the zone which is used for a use allowed in Zone C-3, as described in Part 5 of Chapter 22.28, the

standards, review and permit provisions prescribed in Zone C-3, as contained in subsection D.4, shall apply.

~~5.~~ 6. Minor Variations.

a. The director may permit minor variations from the following standards ~~specified in subsections~~:

i. height of freestanding business signs as specified in subsection D.2.~~b.ii~~ a.i(B)(2);

ii. sign area of freestanding business signs as specified in subsection D.2.~~b.iii~~ a.i(B)(3);

iii. wall business signs as specified in subsection D.2.~~c.i~~ a.i(C)(1);

iv. awning signs as specified in subsection D.2.~~d~~ a.i(D);

v. freestanding business signs as specified in subsection D.3.b~~,~~; and

vi. parking lot landscaping, as it applies to existing parking lots as of the effective date of this subsection, as specified in subsection D.3~~2~~.~~c~~a.ii.

~~of this section where an applicant's request for a minor variation demonstrates to the satisfaction of the director all of the following:~~

~~i.~~ b. Burden of Proof. To be granted a minor variation, the applicant shall show, to the satisfaction of the director of planning:

i. that ~~T~~the application of these standards would result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the goals of the Rowland Heights Community Plan;

ii. that ~~T~~there are exceptional circumstances or conditions applicable to the subject property or to the intended development of the property that do not generally apply to other properties within the District; and

iii. that ~~G~~granting the requested minor variation will not be materially detrimental to properties or improvements in the area or contrary to the goals of the Rowland Heights Community Plan.

~~b.~~ c. Procedure. The procedure for filing a request for a minor variation shall be the same as for a yard modification as provided in Section 22.48.180.

~~c.~~ i. All property owners within ~~100~~ 200 feet of the subject property shall be notified in writing of the requested minor variation not less than 20 days prior to the date the director takes action on the request.

d. A minor variation shall not deviate more than 25 percent from the applicable development standards identified in subsection D.~~5~~6.a.

7. Variance required. Modification of standards contained in subsections D.2.b and D.4.b of this section shall require a variance, as provided in Part 2 of Chapter 22.56. A conditional use permit shall not be used to modify any standards contained in subsections D.2.b and D.4.b of this section nor building height standards as contained in Section 22.28.120.E for the C-1 zone and Section 22.28.170.C for the C-2 zone.

~~6~~8. Recreational Vehicle Parking -- Residential and Agricultural Zones.

a. Definition. As used in this subsection D-~~6~~8, "recreational vehicle" means a camper, camp trailer, travel trailer, house car, motor home, trailer bus, trailer coach or similar vehicle, with or without motive power, designed for human habitation for recreational or emergency occupancy. A recreational vehicle includes a boat, other

watercraft, snowmobile, off-road vehicle that cannot legally be driven on public streets, and other similar types of vehicles. A trailer, whether open or enclosed, used to carry or tow property such as animals, boats or other watercraft, snowmobiles, off-road vehicles, racecars or other similar vehicles is also a recreational vehicle. Where a recreational vehicle is on or attached to such a trailer, they shall together be considered one recreational vehicle. A recreational vehicle shall not include a pickup truck used for transportation to which a camper shell has been attached.

b. A recreational vehicle may be kept, stored, parked, maintained, or otherwise permitted on a lot or parcel of land in Zones A-1, A-2, R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, R-A, and RPD subject to the following restrictions:

i. A recreational vehicle shall not be kept, stored, parked, maintained, or otherwise permitted within five feet of the front lot line or corner side lot line;

ii. No portion of a recreational vehicle exceeding 36 inches in height shall be kept, stored, parked, maintained, or otherwise permitted within 10 feet of the front lot line or corner side lot line;

iii. No more than one recreational vehicle may be kept, stored, parked, maintained, or otherwise permitted in the front yard, corner side yard, or any additional area situated between the corner side yard and the rear lot line;

iv. No recreational vehicle shall be kept, stored, parked, maintained, or otherwise permitted in a manner that prevents access to any required covered parking on the same lot or parcel of land;

v. A recreational vehicle may be kept, stored, parked, maintained, or otherwise permitted only on premises owned or occupied by the owner of the vehicle;

vi. No disabled or otherwise nonfunctional recreational vehicle shall be kept, stored, parked, maintained, or otherwise permitted in the front yard or corner side yard;

vii. A recreational vehicle shall be kept, stored, parked, maintained, or otherwise permitted so as to maintain unobstructed line-of-sight for pedestrians and motorists using the public right-of-way; and

viii. A recreational vehicle shall be kept, stored, parked, maintained, or otherwise permitted so as not to constitute a health or safety hazard.

c. A yard modification may be filed with the director pursuant to Section 22.48.180 to authorize the parking or storing of a recreational vehicle within 10 feet of the front lot line or corner side lot line; provided, however, that under no circumstances shall a recreational vehicle be parked closer than five feet from the front or corner side lot lines. An application for a yard modification under this subsection shall be supported by evidence substantiating that the requested modification is necessary due to topographic features or other conditions in that compliance with the 10-foot setback line would create an unnecessary hardship or unreasonable regulation or where it is obviously impractical to require compliance with the setback line. The director may approve a yard modification if the director finds that parking or storing a recreational vehicle at the proposed location will not compromise pedestrian or motorist line-of-sight or other applicable safety standards as determined by the director, and that the applicant has substantiated to the satisfaction of the director that, due to topographic features or other conditions, compliance with the 10-foot setback line would create an

unnecessary hardship or unreasonable regulation or where it is obviously impractical to require compliance with the setback line.

E. Area-specific Development Standards (Reserved).

Attachment #4

April 22, 2003

TO: **FILE**

FROM: **ADRINE ARAKELIAN**

SUBJECT: **ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION FOR THE AMENDMENT TO THE ROWLAND HEIGHTS COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT (CSD)**

The Rowland Heights Community Standards District was adopted by the Board of Supervisors on November 27, 2001 and first amended by the Board of Supervisors on September 24, 2002. Based on the Initial Study performed to assess the potential environmental impacts of the establishment of the Rowland Heights CSD, it was determined that the CSD would not have a significant effect on the environment and therefore a finding of **Negative Declaration** was approved.

The amendment to the CSD proposes to require the approval of a conditional use permit (CUP) for the establishment of developments which exceed the prescribed thresholds on commercially and industrially zoned properties.

Since there is no substantial change in the environmental impacts of the proposed amendment to the CSD and individual projects, as they are proposed, will undergo appropriate reviews to assess potential environmental impacts, the prior determination of **Negative Declaration** still applies.

APPROVED BY: SORIN ALEXANIAN

Revised February 10, 2004

APPROVED BY: JULIE MOORE

NEGATIVE DECLARATION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS: *November 27, 2001*

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

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT: ROWLAND HEIGHTS COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT

1. **DESCRIPTION:**
The Rowland Heights Community Standards District (CSD) is intended to implement development standards contained in the adopted community plan and to address special problems that are unique to the Rowland Heights community. The CSD establishes community-wide property maintenance standards, a reduction in sign area permitted in commercial zones, the addition of landscaping requirements in commercial and residential zones and building height and setback requirements in commercial zones. In addition, under certain circumstances, the CSD allows for parking of recreational vehicles on residential properties.

2. **LOCATION:**
The CSD boundary is coterminous with the Rowland Heights Community Plan area.

3. **PROPONENT:**
Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning

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

5. **LOCATIONS AND CUSTODIAN OF RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS:**

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: Community Studies 1, Department of Regional Planning

DATE: March 26, 2001

STAFF USE ONLY

PROJECT NUMBER: *Rowland Hts CSD*
CASES:

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

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING

GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A. Map Date: Staff Member: *Mark Child*

Thomas Guide: *678-679* USGS Quad: *La Habra*

Location: *Rowland Heights, Los Angeles County*

Description of Project: *The Rowland Heights Community Standards District (CSD) is intended to implement development standards contained in the adopted community plan and to address special problems that are unique to the Rowland Heights community. The CSD establishes community-wide property maintenance standards, a reduction in sign area permitted in commercial zones, the addition of landscaping requirements in commercial and residential zones and building height and setback requirements in commercial zones. In addition, under certain circumstances, the CSD allows for parking of recreational vehicles on residential properties.*

Gross Acres: *8,463.7 acres*

Environmental Setting: *Rowland Heights is located on the northern side of the Puente Hills and to the south of the Pomona Freeway. The community boundary extends from the City of Industry on the north to Orange County on the south; the City of Diamond Bar forms the eastern boundary while the western boundaries consist of unincorporated Hacienda Heights and the City of La Habra Heights. Slopes within the area range from nearly level to steeply sloping. Most of the near level portions of the community have been developed with residential, commercial and some manufacturing uses. The majority of the steeply sloping portions of area remain as permanent open space.*

Zoning: *A-1, A-2, R-A, R-1, R-2, R-3, R-4, RPD, C-1, C-2, C-3, CPD, C-R, M-1, M-1.5, O-S*

General Plan: *N1, N2, U1, U2, U3, U4, I, O, C and P*

Community/Area wide Plan: *Rowland HeightsCommunity Plan*

Major projects in area:

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION & STATUS
N/A	

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

REVIEWING AGENCIES

Responsible Agencies

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

Trustee Agencies

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

Special Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ None
- ☐ Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy
- ☐ National Parks
- ☐ National Forest
- ☐ Edwards Air Force Base
- ☐ Resource Conservation District of Santa Monica Mtns. Area
- ☒ *City of Walnut*
- ☒ *City of La Puente*
- ☒ *City of Diamond Bar*
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

Regional Significance

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

County Reviewing Agencies

- ☐ Subdivision Committee
- ☒ DPW:
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐
- ☐

IMPACT ANALYSIS MATRIX		ANALYSIS SUMMARY (See individual pages for details)				
			Less than Significant Impact/No Impact			
				Less than Significant Impact with Project Mitigation		
					Potentially Significant Impact	
CATEGORY	**FACTOR**	Pg				Potential Concern
HAZARDS	1. Geotechnical	5	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Flood	6	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Fire	7	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Noise	8	☒	☐	☐	
RESOURCES	1. Water Quality	9	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Air Quality	10	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Biota	11	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Cultural Resources	12	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Mineral Resources	13	☒	☐	☐	
	6. Agriculture Resources	14	☒	☐	☐	
	7. Visual Qualities	15	☒	☐	☐	
SERVICES	1. Traffic/Access	16	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Sewage Disposal	17	☐	☐	☐	*Not Applicable*
	3. Education	18	☐	☐	☐	*Not Applicable*
	4. Fire/Sheriff	19	☒	☐	☐	
	5. Utilities	20	☐	☐	☐	*Not Applicable*
OTHER	1. General	21	☒	☐	☐	
	2. Environmental Safety	22	☒	☐	☐	
	3. Land Use	23	☒	☐	☐	
	4. Pop/Hous./Emp./Rec.	24	☒	☐	☐	
	5. 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: *N/A*
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, inasmuch 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: Mark Child Date: 3/26/01

Approved by: Sorin Alexanian Date: 3/26/01

☐ Determination appealed – see attached sheet.

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

HAZARDS - 1. Geotechnical

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☒	☐	☐	Is the project located in an active or potentially active fault zone, Seismic Hazards Zone, or Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone? *Whittier Heights Fault*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area containing a major landslide(s)?
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?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed project considered a sensitive use (school, hospital, public assembly site) located in close proximity to a significant geotechnical hazard?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project entail substantial grading and/or alteration of topography including slopes of over 25%?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

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

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

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

Development not a part of this project. Geotechnical analysis not required.

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 the major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a dashed line, located on the project site? *San Jose Creek*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located within or does it contain a floodway, floodplain, or designated flood hazard zone?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in or subject to high mudflow conditions?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project contribute or be subject to high erosion and debris deposition from run-off?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., dam failure)?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Building Ordinance No. 2225 – Section 308A ☐ Ordinance No. 12,114 (Floodways)

☐ Approval of Drainage Concept by DPW

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

Development not a part of this project. Flood analysis not required.

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 high fire hazard area (Fire Zone 4)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site in a high fire hazard area and served by inadequate access due to lengths, width, surface materials, turnarounds or grade?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project site have more than 75 dwelling units on a single access in a high fire hazard area?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an area having inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project located in close proximity to potential dangerous fire hazard conditions/uses (such as refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing)?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Water Ordinance No. 7834 ☐ Fire Ordinance No. 2947 ☐ Fire Prevention Guide No.46

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

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)? *Pomona Freeway*
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use considered sensitive (school, hospital, senior citizen facility) or are there other sensitive uses in close proximity?
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?
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?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

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

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

Development not a part of this project. Noise study not required.

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?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the proposed project require the use of a private sewage disposal system?
	☐	☐	☐	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?
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?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Industrial Waste Permit
☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No.2269
☐ Health Code – Ordinance No.7583, Chapter 5
☐ NPDES Permit CAS614001 Compliance (DPW)

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely 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 users or (b) 40 gross acres, 650,000 square feet of floor area or 1,000 employees for non-residential uses)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposal considered a sensitive use (schools, hospitals, parks) and located 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 per Screening Tables of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project generate or is the site in close proximity to sources that create obnoxious odors, dust, and/or hazardous emissions?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially 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 applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emission which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?
h.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Health and Safety Code – Section 40506

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Project Design ☐ Air Quality Report

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project have a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on, or be adversely 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 Significant Ecological Area (SEA), SEA Buffer, or coastal Sensitive Environmental Resource (ESHA, etc.), or is the site relatively undisturbed and natural?
				Rowland Heights SEA
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will grading, fire clearance, or flood related improvements remove substantial natural habitat areas?
c.	☒	☐	☐	Is a major drainage course, as identified on USGS quad sheets by a blue dashed line, located on the project site?
				San Jose Creek
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.)?
e.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project site contain oak or other unique native trees (specify kinds of trees)?
f.	☐	☐	☒	Is the project site habitat for any known sensitive species (federal or state listed endangered, etc.)?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., wildlife corridor, adjacent open space linkage)?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

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

Development not a part of this project. SEA and San Jose Creek not affected by project.

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) that indicate potential archaeological sensitivity?
b.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project site contain rock formations indicating potential paleontological resources?
c.	☐	☐	☒	Does the project site contain known historic structures or sites?
d.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource as defined in 15064.5?
e.	☐	☐	☒	Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Phase 1 Archaeology Report

Development not a part of this project.

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?
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?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

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?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment that due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

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?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project substantially visible from or will it obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? *Not a specific project.*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project site located in an undeveloped or undisturbed area that contains unique aesthetic features?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Is the proposed use out-of-character in comparison to adjacent uses because of height, bulk, or other features?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Is the project likely to create substantial sun shadow, light or glare problems?
f.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

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

The CSD is not a specific development project and will therefore not directly affect visual quality. Changes in the sign ordinance to reduce the size of signs in commercial zones would improve the appearance within the community's viewshed. RV parking is considered compatible with the residential character of the community and would be restricted to certain areas.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave 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 (mid-block or intersections)?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in any hazardous traffic conditions? *Parking of recreational vehicles in the front and side yards of residential lots*
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in parking problems with a subsequent impact on traffic conditions? *Parking of recreational vehicles in the front and side yards of residential lots*
d.	☐	☒	☐	Will inadequate access during an emergency (other than fire hazards) result in problems for emergency vehicles or residents/employees in the area? *Parking of recreational vehicles in the front and side yards of residential lots*
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?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or program supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus, turnouts, bicycle racks)?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors (e.g., grading or landform alteration)?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

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

RV parking permit could reduce traffic hazards by reducing the number of RVs parked on public streets. Criteria for RV parking permit would require the following: (1) Vehicular access to the required covered parking area be maintained and therefore no net loss of off-street parking would result. (2) To maintain adequate line-of-sight, a minimum 10 feet setback would be maintained in the front yard between a parked RV and the property line. (3) For the purposes of emergency services personnel accessing the property, a specified separations would be maintained between structures and RVs.

CONCLUSION

Considering the above information, could the project leave a significant impact (individually or cumulatively) on **traffic/access** factors?

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

SERVICES - 2. Sewage Disposal

Not Applicable

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☐	If served by a community sewage system, could the project create capacity problems at the treatment plant?
b.	☐	☐	☐	Could the project create capacity problems in the sewer lines serving the project site?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Sanitary Sewers and Industrial Waste – Ordinance No. 6130

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

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

Not Applicable

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☐	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at the district level?
b.	☐	☐	☐	Could the project create capacity problems at individual schools that will serve the project site?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Could the project create student transportation problems?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Could the project create substantial library impacts due to increased population and demand?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

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

CONCLUSION

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

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

SERVICES - 4. Fire/Sheriff Services

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project create staffing or response time problems at the fire station or sheriff's substation serving the project site?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are there any special fire or law enforcement problems associated with the project or the general area?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/ OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Fire Mitigation Fee

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

Not Applicable

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?
b.	☐	☐	☐	Is the project site in an area known to have an inadequate water supply and/or pressure to meet fire fighting needs?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Could the project create problems with providing utility services, such as electricity, gas, or propane?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Are there any other known service problem areas (e.g., solid waste)?
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)?
c.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

☐ Plumbing Code – Ordinance No. 2269 ☐ Water Code – Ordinance No. 7834

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design

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?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a major change in the patterns, scale, or character of the general area or community?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Will the project result in a significant reduction in the amount of agricultural land?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

STANDARD MITIGATION MEASURES

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

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS/MITIGATIONS

☐ Lot Size ☐ Project Design ☐ Compatible Use

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?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Are any pressurized tanks to be used or any hazardous wastes stored on-site?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Are any residential units, schools, or hospitals located within 500 feet and potentially adversely affected?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Have there been previous uses that indicate residual soil toxicity of the site?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment involving the accidental release of hazardous materials into the environment?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
g.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project be located on a site that 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?
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?
i.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
j.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

☐ Toxic Clean-up Plan

CONCLUSION

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

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

OTHER FACTORS - 3. Land Use

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the plan designation(s) of the subject property?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the zoning designation of the subject property?
c.				Can the project be found to be inconsistent with the following applicable land use criteria:
	☐	☒	☐	Hillside Management Criteria?
	☐	☒	☐	SEA Conformance Criteria?
	☐	☐	☐	Other?
d.	☐	☐	☐	Would the project physically divide an established community?
e.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

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

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

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

SETTING/IMPACTS

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
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)?
c.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
d.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project result in substantial job/housing imbalance or substantial increase in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)?
e.	☐	☒	☐	Could the project require new or expanded recreational facilities for future residents?
f.	☐	☒	☐	Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
g.	☐	☐	☐	Other factors?

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

CONCLUSION

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

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

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

	Yes	No	Maybe	
a.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
b.	☐	☒	☐	Does the project have possible environmental effects that 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

SUMMARY OF RPC PROCEEDINGS

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENT TO COUNTY CODE TITLE 22 (PLANNING AND ZONING) TO AMEND THE ROWLAND HEIGHTS COMMUNITY STANDARDS DISTRICT

May 28, 2003

A duly noticed public hearing was held before the Regional Planning Commission ("Commission"). Three persons testified at the hearing, two in support and one in opposition. Six persons submitted written testimony, five in support and one in opposition. Staff presented the CSD amendment applicable to commercial zones which would require a conditional use permit for development exceeding specific thresholds based on buildings square footage, the number of stories, and change and/or intensification of use resulting in significant increase in the occupant load applicable to new buildings and additions to buildings. The Commission closed the public hearing, recommended approval of the CSD amendment, and directed staff to return on consent with the revised ordinance. The Commission recognized that there were other adjustments that could have been made to the CSD amendment, but because an urgency ordinance was adopted by the Board on April 29, 2003, the Commission felt the necessity to take an action. They explained that the CSD could be revised at a later date as necessary.

June 18, 2003

In consideration of concerns raised at the June 10, 2003 Board hearing for extension of the urgency ordinance requiring a CUP for development in commercial zones exceeding the specified thresholds, the Commission voted to reopen the public hearing. The hearing was scheduled for July 23, 2003.

July 23, 2003

A duly noticed public hearing was held before the Commission. Two persons testified, one in support and one in opposition. Eight persons submitted written testimony, five in support and three in opposition. Staff presented a revised CSD amendment according to the Commission's comments made at the May 28th public hearing, as well as an alternative option developed in response to the concerns of the Rowland Heights business community. The public hearing was continued to August 11, 2003.

August 11, 2003

A continued public hearing was held in Rowland Heights at Alvarado Intermediate School. Staff presented the CSD amendment and alternative options that were discussed at the July 23rd public hearing. Nineteen persons testified, seven in support and twelve in opposition. A petition with over 200 signatures was submitted in opposition. The Commission requested that staff revise the CSD amendment to establish project review thresholds based on trip generation (net daily vehicle trips generated by the use), as opposed to the previously recommended building square footage standard. The

Commission also asked that staff recommend a set of development standards applicable to commercial zones. The public hearing was continued to September 24, 2003.

September 24, 2003
A continued public hearing was held before the Commission. Staff presented an array of options for the CSD amendment that included development standards, trip generation standards, and creation of a community webpage. Eleven persons testified, nine in support and two in opposition. Seven persons submitted written testimony, six in support and one in opposition. A petition with 80 signatures was also submitted in support. The Commission closed the public hearing, recommended approval of the CSD amendment, and directed staff to return on consent with revisions to the development standards and the appropriate trip generation standards.

November 24, 2003
Additional information was presented by staff regarding possible alternative project review procedures for the CSD amendment that staff is scheduled to discuss with the community at their public meeting on January 7, 2004. As a result, the Commission voted to reopen the public hearing on the Rowland Heights CSD amendment to allow for discussion and consideration of alternative procedures.

January 12, 2004
The Commission went on a field trip to Rowland Heights. The purpose of the field trip was to view vacant industrially and commercially zoned properties, to view developed properties that members of the community have expressed concerns about, and to experience the level of traffic congestion during the evening commute hours.

January 28, 2004
A duly noticed public hearing was held before the Commission. Staff presented three options for the Commission's consideration. Nineteen persons testified, nine in support and ten in opposition. Ten persons submitted written testimony, three in support and seven in opposition. In addition, a letter representing the consensus decision of 499 members of the Ridgemoor Homeowners Association was submitted in support. Two sets of petitions were also submitted, one with over 200 signatures in support, the second with over 800 signatures in opposition. The Commission also requested a show of hands in support of and in opposition to the CSD amendment. The result of the audience poll was 10 in support and 55 in opposition. The Commission closed the public hearing and recommended approval of the CSD amendment to the Board of Supervisors. The Commission felt the necessity to take an action because of the urgency ordinance in effect that is set to expire on April 27, 2004. The Commission requested that staff evaluate the CSD amendment in light of the concerns raised at the public hearing and make any appropriate changes to be discussed at the Board public hearing and incorporated into the final ordinance. They explained that the CSD could be revised at a later date as necessary.

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

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a public hearing will be held before the Board of Supervisors, in Room 381, Hall of Administration, 500 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, at **9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, March 23, 2004** pursuant to Title 22 of the Los Angeles County Code and Title 7 of the Government Code (the Planning and Zoning Law) for the purpose of hearing testimony relative to the adoption of the following amendments:

Amendments to Title 22 – Planning and Zoning of the Los Angeles County Code to amend the Rowland Heights Community Standards District ("CSD"). The objective of the proposed amendment to the CSD is to review and assess, on a case by case basis, the impacts (e.g. traffic, neighborhood compatibility, etc.) of proposed development projects on commercially and industrially zoned properties which exceed the minimum thresholds as proposed in the CSD. The proposed amendments require additional development standards and appropriate procedures such as, a director's review (ministerial or discretionary), or a conditional use permit for certain proposed development on commercially and industrially zoned properties and other amendments which, in the opinion of the Board of Supervisors, should be considered.

Written comments may be sent to the Executive Office of the Board of Supervisors at the above address. If you do not understand this notice or need more information, please call Ms. Julie Moore at (213) 974-6425 between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday, or e-mail her at jmoore@planning.co.la.ca.us. Project materials will also be available for review on the website, http://planning.co.la.ca.us under the link "Public Review Documents".

如閣下看不懂這份傳單或是需要進一步資訊，請電

(213) 974-6461

Si necesita más información referente a este caso favor de llamar al Departamento de Planificación con Maria Majcherek al (213) 974-6425 dentro de las horas de 7:30 a.m. y 6:00 p.m., de Lunes a Jueves. Nuestras oficinas estan ceradas los Viernes.

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

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

VIOLET VARONA-LUKENS
EXECUTIVE OFFICER-CLERK OF
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS