PROPOSED
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

12-Unit Multi-Family Residential
Case Nos. PDR 1525251 and PAE 1827399
534 and 538 North Kenwood Street

The following Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 as amended, the State Guidelines, and the Environmental Guidelines and Procedures of the City of Glendale.	
Project Title/Common Name:	12-Unit Multi-Family Residential Project
Project Location:	534 and 538 North Kenwood Street, Glendale, Los Angeles County
Project Description: The proposed project involves demolition of an existing one-story Colonial Craftsman style single-family residence (built in 1922 and altered in 1928) located at 538 North Kenwood Street, preservation and rehabilitation of an existing two-story Aeroplane Craftsman Style single-family residence (built in 1913) located at 534 North Kenwood Street, and construction of a new 11-unit, three-story residential building, for a total of 12 residential units on two adjoining lots totaling 15,000 square feet in area (0.34 acres), in the R-1250 (High Density Residential) zone. The existing two detached two-car garages located on the project site will be demolished and a total of 27 parking spaces will be provided for the project including 26 parking spaces in a new one-level subterranean parking garage, and one unenclosed parking with access from the public alley along the east boundary of the project site. The project includes common open space, private open spaces, and landscaping. The project site contains a Coast live oak tree (14 inches in diameter), which is protected by the City's Indigenous Tree Protection Ordinance. The oak tree is located between two existing single-family residences at 534 and 358 North Kenwood Street and is proposed to be removed. The applicant has requested the approval of an Administrative Exception to exceed the allowable lot coverage by 2.48 percent (the maximum allowed lot coverage is 50 percent). The project also requires approval from the Design Review Board for the design.	
Project Type:	☒ Private Project ☐ Public Project
Project Applicant:	Hamlet Zohrabians 3467 Ocean View Blvd, Suite B Glendale, CA 91208
Findings:	The Director of Community Development, on **May 10, 2019**, after considering an Initial Study prepared by the Planning Division, found that the above referenced project, as mitigated, would not have a significant effect on the environment and instructed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be prepared.
Mitigation Measures:	See attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP)
Attachments:	Initial Study Checklist
Contact Person:	Aileen Babakhani, Planning Associate City of Glendale Community Development Department 633 East Broadway Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206-4386 Tel: (818) 937-8331; Fax: (818) 240-0392

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

The following mitigation measures shall apply to the proposed multi-family development project, located at 534 and 538 North Kenwood Street, to reduce identified impacts to less than significant levels.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

MM-1 The applicant shall obtain an Indigenous Tree Permit (ITP) prior to building permit issuance for the removal of the existing Coast Live Oak tree on the project site and comply with the City's Urban Forestry comments dated November 16, 2018, which shall include the following:

a) Four (4) replacement trees shall be planted on site by substituting the proposed four (4) Toyon species, proposed on the landscape plan, with four (4) scrub oak (Quercus Berberidifolia).

b) The four (4) replacement trees shall be guaranteed to survive three (3) years after planting and shall be replaced if they die within the three (3) year period.

c) The four (4) replacement trees shall be indicated on the final landscaping plan.

d) The applicant shall pay ITP permit fees as determined by the City Arborist.

Monitoring Action: Plan Review
Timing: Prior to Building Permit issuance (plan review)
For a period of three years after project completion
Responsibility: Director of Public works

CULTURAL RESOURCES

MM-2 The development of the new three-story, multi-family residential building and preservation of the existing two-story, single-family residence at 534 North Kenwood Street shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and shall follow the "Design Review and Rehabilitation Plan" prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc. dated May 19, 2017 for restoration and rehabilitation of the single-family residence.

MM-3 If during plan review and/or construction related activities it is determined that modification(s) to the Rehabilitation Plan are necessary, the applicant shall modify the building permit plans and/or suspend work and contact the Planning Division of necessary changes. Prior to commencing work, the applicant shall update the Rehabilitation Plan and submit it to the Planning Division for review and approval.

Monitoring Action: Plan Review; site inspection
Timing: Prior to issuance of development permits (plan review)
Prior to building final inspection
Responsibility: Director of Community Development

AGREEMENT TO PROPOSED MITIGATION MEASURES AND MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

I/WE THE UNDERSIGNED PROJECT APPLICANT(S), HEREBY AGREE TO MODIFICATION OF THE PROJECT TO CONFORM WITH THE IMPACT MITIGATION MEASURES AND THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM SPECIFIED HEREIN REGARDLESS OF CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP. IF I/WE DISAGREE WITH ANY RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES OR ALL OR PART OF THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, IN LIEU OF MY/OUR SIGNATURE HEREON, I/WE MAY REQUEST RECONSIDERATION OF THE MATTER UPON SUBMITTAL OF THE APPLICABLE FEE AND DOCUMENTATION IN SUPPORT OF MY/OUT POSITION ON SAID MITIGATION MEASURES AND/OR MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM. (THE ENVIRONMENTAL AND PLANNING BOARAD WILL RECONSIDER THE ISSUES AND TAKE ACTION AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE).

Signature of Project Applicant(s)	Date:
Signature of Project Applicant(s)	Date:

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
12-Unit Multi-Family Residential Project
534 and 538 North Kenwood Street

1.	**Project Title:** 12-Unit Multi-Family Residential Project
2.	**Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Glendale Community Development Department Planning Division 633 East Broadway, Room 103 Glendale, CA 91206
3.	**Contact Person and Phone Number:** Aileen Babakhani, Planning Associate Tel: (818) 937-8331 Fax: (818) 240-0392
4.	**Project Location:** 534 and 538 North Kenwood Street, Glendale, Los Angeles County
5.	**Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Hamlet Zohrabians 3467 Ocean View Blvd, Suite B Glendale, CA 91208
6.	**General Plan Designation:** High Density Residential
7.	**Zoning:** R-1250(High Density Residential) Zone
8.	**Description of the Project:** The proposed project involves demolition of an existing one-story Colonial Craftsman style single-family residence (built in 1922 and altered in 1928) located at 538 North Kenwood Street, preservation and rehabilitation of an existing two-story Aeroplane Craftsman Style single-family residence (built in 1913) located at 534 North Kenwood Street, and construction of a new 11-unit, three-story residential building, for a total of 12 residential units on two adjoining lots totaling 15,000 square feet in area (0.34 acres), in the R-1250 (High Density Residential) zone. The existing two detached two-car garages located on the project site will be demolished and a total of 27 parking spaces will be provided for the project including 26 parking spaces in a new one-level subterranean parking garage, and one unenclosed parking with access from the public alley along the east boundary of the project site. The project includes common open space, private open spaces, and landscaping. The project site contains Coast live oak tree (14 inches in diameter), which is protected by the City's Indigenous Tree Protection Ordinance. The oak tree is located between two existing single-family residences at 534 and 358 North Kenwood Street and is proposed to be removed. The applicant has requested the approval of an Administrative Exception to exceed the allowable lot coverage by 2.48 percent (the maximum allowed lot coverage is 50 percent). The project also requires approval from the Design Review Board for the design.
9.	**Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** *North:* Multi-family Residential Uses *South:* Multi-family Residential Uses *East:* Multi-family Residential Uses *West:* Multi-family Residential Uses
10.	**Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval or participation agreement).** None

11. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forest Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☐ Geology / Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards / Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

LEAD AGENCY DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Aileen Babakhani — 5/8/19

Prepared by: Date:

Signature of Director of Community Development or his or her designee authorizing the release of environmental document for public review and comment.

5/9/19

Director of Community Development: Date:

12. Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The following section provides an evaluation of the impact categories and questions contained in the checklist and identifies mitigation measures, if applicable.

A. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
3. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X	

1) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact. No scenic vistas, as identified in the Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993), exist within or in proximity to the project site. Therefore, no impacts to scenic vistas would result from project implementation.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact. No state scenic highway is located adjacent to, or within view of the project site. No impacts to scenic resources within a State scenic highway would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located in an urbanized area and surrounded by single-family and multi-family residential buildings. The nearby buildings were built during various time periods in variety of architectural styles. The proposed development is similar in use, scale, and style of the neighboring buildings. The project site contains one Coast Live Oak tree (14-inches in diameter). The City's Urban Forestry Division reviewed and evaluated the project and granted the

removal of the oak tree due to its location in relation to the proposed development subject to mitigation (See Section D.5 below for discussion of mitigation measures).

Review and approval of the Design Review Board in regard to the site planning, mass and scale, architecture, materials, and landscaping along with compliance with the zoning standards and City's Comprehensive Design Guidelines would ensure that the project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The applicant's request for a deviation from the Zoning Code to exceed the allowable lot coverage by 2.48 percent would not significantly impact the scenic quality since the proposed 4,220 square feet of landscaping and open space, which is 470 square feet more than required open space landscaped area, will be provided on the site. With the mitigation measures consistent with the applicable standards, impacts to visual character and quality of the site are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact. Day and nighttime lighting for the project would only represent a slight increase above existing conditions and would be similar to the existing multi-family buildings within the project vicinity. Therefore, no significant impacts associated with day and nighttime lighting is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

B. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Code section 51104(g))?				
4. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X

1) 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?

No Impact. There is no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance within or adjacent to the proposed project site and no agricultural activities take place on the project site. No agricultural use zone currently exists within the City, nor are any agricultural zones proposed. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

No Impact. The proposed project site is located in an urbanized area, developed with other buildings similar in use, scale, and style to the proposed structure. No portion of the project site is proposed to include agricultural zoning designations or uses, nor do any such uses exist within the city under the current General Plan and zoning. There are no Williamson Act contracts in effect for the project site or surrounding vicinity. No conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract would result. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No Impact. There is no existing zoning of forest land or timberland in the City of Glendale. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. There is no forest land within the City of Glendale. No forest land would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. There is no farmland or forest land in the vicinity of or on the proposed project site. No farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use and no forest land would be converted to non-forest use under the proposed project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

C. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				**X**
2. 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?			**X**	
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			**X**	
4. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			**X**	

1) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No Impact. The project site is located within the City of Glendale, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin (Basin) and is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD is the agency responsible for preparing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Basin. Since 1979, a number of AQMPs have been prepared. The most recent comprehensive plan fully approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) is the 2016 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), which includes a variety of strategies and control measures.

The AQMP was prepared to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the areas under the jurisdiction of SCAQMD, to return clean air to the region, and to minimize the impact on the economy. Projects that are considered to be consistent with the AQMP would not interfere with attainment because this growth is included in the projections utilized in the formulation of the AQMP. Therefore, projects, uses, and activities that are consistent with the applicable assumption used in the development of the AQMP would not jeopardize attainment of the air quality levels identified in the AQMP, even if they exceed the SCAQMD's recommended daily emissions thresholds. Projects that are consistent with the projections of employment and population forecasts identified in the Growth Management Chapter of the Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) are considered consistent with the AQMP growth projections, since the Growth Management Chapter forms the basis of the land use and transportation control portions of the AQMP.

Population growth associated with the Project is included in the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) projects for growth in the City of Glendale. The proposed project would not result in population and housing growth that would cause growth in Glendale to exceed the SCAG

forecast, because the project is consistent with the General Plan and therefore is included in SCAG's growth projections. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with AQMP attainment forecasts and with applicable air quality plans. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. Air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants are a result of past and present development, and the Southern California Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) develops and implements plans for future attainment of ambient air quality standards. Based on these considerations, project-level thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants are relevant in the determination of whether a project's individual emissions would have cumulatively significant impact on air quality.

The proposed project involves demolition of an existing one-story, 2,040 square-foot single-family residence, preservation and rehabilitation of an existing two-story, 1,890 square-foot single-family residence, and construction of a new 11-unit, 14,835 square-foot residential building with underground, one-level parking garage. A total of 3,870 cubic yards of soil will be graded and exported offsite. A quantitative analysis was conducted to determine whether proposed construction and operational activities may result in emissions of criteria air pollutants that may cause exceedance of the Nationals Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), or contribute to existing nonattainment of ambient air quality standards. Pollutants that are evaluated herein include reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx), which are important because they are precursors to O3, as well as CO, sulfur oxides (SOx), PM10, and PM2.5.

Construction of the project would result in the temporary addition of pollutants to the local air shed caused by on-site sources (i.e., off-road construction equipment, soil disturbance, and ROG off-gassing) and off-site sources (i.e., on-road haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicle trips). Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation, and for dust, the prevailing weather conditions. Therefore, such emission levels can only be approximately estimated with a corresponding uncertainty in precise ambient air quality impacts.

Criteria air pollutant emissions associated with temporary construction activities were quantified using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.2. Implementation of the project would generate air pollutant emissions from entrained dust, off-road equipment, vehicle emissions, and architectural coatings. Entrained dust results from the exposure of earth surfaces to wind from the dirt direct disturbance and movement of soil, resulting in PM10 and PM2.5 emissions. The project would be required to comply with applicable rules under SCAQMD Rule 403 to control dust emissions generated during grading activities. Standard construction practices that would be employed to reduce fugitives dust emissions include watering of the active sites. Internal combustion engines used by construction equipment, vendor trucks (i.e., delivery trucks), and workers vehicles would result in emissions of ROG, NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5.

Results from the model indicate that the proposed project would not exceed thresholds for construction, area, or operational impacts. A summary of the results are attached. As a result, less than significant impacts will occur.

3) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is surrounded by sensitive receptors that include single-family and multi-family dwellings. The applicant would be required to adhere to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMAD) Rule 403-Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the less than significant impact related to construction-related impacts identified in Response C.2 above. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to a substantial pollutant concentration or create emissions that exceed known thresholds. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed project may generate detectable odors. However, any detectable odors would be associated with initial construction and would be considered short-term. Significant long-term odor impacts are not anticipated to occur from the project since it is a residential use. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
2. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
4. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
wildlife nursery sites?				
5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		X		
6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

1) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been urbanized for many years. The area was originally developed with single-family residences dating back to the early 1900's and later redeveloped with multi-family residential buildings. The area of the project is not identified as a Significant Ecological area in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element. No wildlife species other than those, which can tolerate human activity and/or are typically found in urban environments are known to exist onsite or in the vicinity of the site. These human-tolerant species are neither sensitive, threatened, nor endangered. Implementation of the project would not result in any impact to species identified as endangered, threatened, sensitive or being of special concern by the California Department of Fish and Wildfire or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No riparian habitat and/or other sensitive natural communities are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been heavily urbanized for many years. No federally protected wetlands are present within the vicinity, and no such areas are present onsite or adjacent to the project site. No impacts would occur.

***Mitigation Measures*:** No mitigation measures are required.

4) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

No Impact. The proposed project is located in an area that has been urbanized for many years and has been substantially modified by human activity. Implementation of the proposed project will not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated. The Glendale Municipal Code, Section 12.44 (Indigenous Trees), contains guidelines for protection and removal of six different native or indigenous species of trees that include Coast Live Oak, Valley Oak, Mesa Oak, Scrub Oak, California Sycamore, and California Bay, which measure six inches or more in diameter breast height (DBH).

The proposed project is located in the area that has been heavily urbanized. One Coast Live Oak tree (14 inches in diameter) was identified on the project site. The oak tree is located between two existing dwelling units at 534 and 358 North Kenwood Street. Removing the oak tree is unavoidable due to the construction activities including demolition and excavation, occurring within the dripline of the oak tree. The City's Urban Forestry Division evaluated the project and granted the removal of the oak tree providing the following comments and conditions. A mitigation measure has been added to the project requiring the applicant to plant four replacement trees and insuring their survival for a period of three years that would reduce impact to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measure would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

MM-1 The applicant shall obtain an Indigenous Tree Permit (ITP) prior to building permit issuance for the removal of the existing Coast Live Oak tree on the project site and comply with the City's Urban Forestry comments dated November 16, 2018, which shall include the following:

a) Four (4) replacement trees shall be planted on site by substituting the proposed four (4) Toyon species, proposed on the landscape plan, with four (4) scrub oak (Quercus Berberidifolia).

b) The four (4) replacement trees shall be guaranteed to survive three (3) years after planting and shall be replaced if they die within the three (3) year period.

c) The four (4) replacement trees shall be indicated on the final landscaping plan.

d) The applicant shall pay ITP permit fees as determined by the City Arborist.

6) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

No Impact. No Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plan has been adopted to include the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any such plans. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X		
2. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			X	
3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			X	

1) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is currently developed with two single-family dwelling units located at 534 and 538 North Kenwood Street. Each dwelling has a detached two-car garage. The house at 534 North Kenwood Street was constructed in 1913 and the house at 538 North Kenwood Street was constructed in 1922 and altered in 1928. The house at 534 North Kenwood is a two-story, 1,890 square-feet house, designed in Aeroplane Craftsman style. The house at 538 North Kenwood Street is one-story, 2,040 square-feet in size, and designed in a Colonial Craftsman style. Although the existing residences are not currently listed on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources or the National Register of Historic Places, the two-story house at 534 North Kenwood Street was assigned a California Historical Resource Status Code of 5S3 (Appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation) in the 2007 Craftsman Survey and the 2018 South Glendale Historic Resources Survey. This makes the property a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 (a) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The one-story house at 538 North Kenwood Street was determined to be ineligible for listing at the local level although it does warrant special consideration in local planning (California Historical Status Code of 6L); therefore, it is not considered a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Staff determined that the house at 538 North Kenwood Street was not eligible for designation at the Local, State, or Federal level; however, the existing house at 534 North Kenwood Street does meet the criteria for listing on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources would be eligible for the Glendale Register of Historic Resources under Criterion 3 as it “embodies the distinctive…characteristics of an architectural style, architectural type, [or] period...”.

The current project is proposing to demolish the house and two-car garage at 538 North Kenwood Street, demolish the detached two-car garage at 534 North Kenwood Street (it is not considered to be a contributing feature of the property and it is in poor condition), restore and preserve the existing two-story house at 534 North Kenwood Street, and construct a new 11-unit apartment building on the remaining portion of the two properties. The proposal allows for reasonable development of the site in accordance with the City of Glendale's Zoning Ordinance as well as the General Plan Land Use Designation of high density residential, while retaining the overall historic character of the house and its ongoing eligibility for listing on the Glendale Register of Historic Resources.

The proposed project will meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. It will therefore not have any substantial adverse change to the cultural resource. A design review and rehabilitation plan for the house at 534 North Kenwood Street was prepared in May of 2017 by Sapphos Environmental, Inc. to guide the project and ensure it complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The plan documents character-defining features of the house and recommends treatment plans for architectural features including roof, rafter tails, gable vents, cross-bracing, fascia boards, wood shingle siding, primary wood entrance with side lights, wood French doors with decorative and unique muntins, porch, concrete piers, and original fenestrations including casement and hung wood windows with decorative and unique muntins. The proposal will retain and restore the significant character defining-features where feasible and all replacement features will be compatible with the design and materials of the historic house. A small early addition at the second floor of the side and rear elevation (northeast corner) was constructed at an unknown date and blends with the architecture of the house. The addition features one 15-light wood casement window and five window openings that are either boarded up, the windows have been removed, or have been replaced with a jalousie or louvered windows. The project will retain the small early addition and convert it to a bathroom; however, the proposal calls to remove the 15-light casement window and five other window openings (non-original windows) in the area of the addition and replace them with two smaller windows compatible with the existing original window type, size, and materials.

As proposed, the property at 534 North Kenwood Street will retain all of its character-defining features including the overall shape of the building, materials, craftsmanship, decorative detailing, and also its site and setting. The scale, massing, and setback contribute to the setting of the building; however, the block of Kenwood Street, where the house is located, has largely been developed with apartment buildings which do not contribute to the building's setting. The house will continue to convey the significance of its architectural design, typology, and period of construction and will remain eligible for the Glendale and California Register. This will reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level.

The National Park Service defines rehabilitation as, "the process of returning a property to a state of utility, through repair or alteration, which makes possible an efficient contemporary use while preserving those portions and features of the property which are significant to its historic, architectural, and cultural values." The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation are a set of federal guidelines for the treatment of historic properties. There are ten standards, each of which is listed below and analyzed to address the subject project.

Standard 1 - A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships. There is no change proposed to the use of the building on the property. The existing building will be restored and continue as a residential use.

Standard 2 - **The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.** The historic character of the property including its distinctive materials and features, will be retained and preserved through the restoration of exterior elevations. The primary façade of the building will be retained and repaired including wood windows with decorative and unique muntins, primary entry, French doors, concrete porch and piers, rafter tails, cross-bracing, and fascia boards. The existing wood shingle siding and windows at the side and rear façade will be repaired to the extent feasible or replaced in kind. Therefore, the project complies with Standard for Rehabilitation No. 2. If during plan review and/or construction related activities it is determined that modification(s) to the Rehabilitation Plan are necessary, a mitigation measure (MM-3) has been added to the project requiring the applicant to modify the building permit plans and/or suspend work and contact the Planning Division of necessary changes. Planning staff site inspection is also required prior to final building inspection.

Standard 3 - Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken. A small early addition located at the northeast corner of the second-floor (side and rear façade), which was built at an unknown date will be retained. The project proposes to remove a wood 15-light casement window and five window openings in the area of the addition and replace them with two smaller windows (one window on each facade) in keeping with the existing windows in terms of the size, material, shape, and operation. The existing original wood windows have wide wood surrounds and extended lintels. Therefore, the building will not change in a manner that creates a false sense of historical development. Furthermore, the new construction of the apartment building on-site will reflect, but not be imitative, of the historic structure's style. The proposed three-story configuration of the new units is an unavoidable result of the applicants desire to add marketable units to the site. Efforts to articulate the new units are relatively successful given the site and programmatic constraints. Staff believes that the new and old structures are clearly differentiated and that there is not a false sense of historical development.

Standard 4 - Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved. The small early addition at second floor is not visible from the public right of way; however, it will be retained and rehabilitated. There are no other apparent changes to the property that have gained significance over time. Therefore, the project complies with Standard for Rehabilitation No. 4.

Standard 5 - Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved. The project complies with this standard because no distinctive, character-defining aspects of the house will be lost. The windows with distinctive and unique muntins (front façade), French doors, and primary entry will be

repaired. All other exterior portions of the house will be retained and repaired to the extent feasible or replaced in kind. The project is proposing to maintain the small early addition at the second floor of the house but replace its non-original windows (which are not considered distinctive features) to two new wood single pane windows to match the existing original windows. The location of the window openings in the area of the small early addition will be closed and covered with new shingle siding to match the existing siding. The mitigation measures (MM-2 and MM-3) will ensure this standard is met.

Standard 6 - Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence. The Design Review and Rehabilitation Plan calls for the repair of all deteriorated historic features to the extent feasible or replaced in kind if damaged to the point where repair is not possible. There are no major missing architectural features to be replaced. The mitigation measures (MM-2 and MM-3) will ensure this standard is met.

Standard 7 - Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used. As proposed, the project would not undertake chemical or physical treatments that could damage the historic materials of the building which is in keeping with this standard. The mitigation measures (MM-2 and MM-3) will ensure this standard is met.

Standard 8 - Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken. It is highly unlikely that archaeological resources are found during ground disturbance; however, if any archaeological resources are discovered during the construction and ground excavation, standard City protocols regarding the discovery of potential below-grade historic resources will address this issue, allowing the project to meet this standard. Furthermore, the Rehabilitation Plan indicates that in the event of archaeological resources discovery, work will stop in that area until the find can be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist(s).

Standard 9 - New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. No addition will be added to the house; however, the small early addition located at the northeast corner of the second-floor which was built at an unknown date will be retained. The project proposes to remove a wood 15-light casement window and five window openings in the area of the addition and replace them with two smaller windows (one window on each side) in keeping with the existing windows in terms of the size, material, shape, and operation. No other new construction will occur and the exterior alterations will not destroy historic materials and features. Therefore, the project meets this standard. Furthermore, the new apartment building will have horizontal siding and hung windows with trim and sill which help harmonize the new building's design with the historic house. The new apartment building paint palette will help differentiate the old and

new designs. The new building will affect the immediate setting of the house; however, the historic setting of the area has already been dramatically altered.

Standard 10 - New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired. The construction of the new apartment building will still make the project meet this standard. If the new apartment building is demolished in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic house will remain intact and unimpaired. As mentioned previously, the new building will change the immediate setting of the house; however, the historic setting of the area has already been dramatically altered.

Mitigation Measures: Compliance with the following mitigation measures will reduce potentially significant impacts on the historic resource to less than significant.

MM-2 The development of the new three-story, multi-family residential building and preservation of the existing two-story, single-family residence at 534 North Kenwood Street shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and shall follow the "Design Review and Rehabilitation Plan" prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc in May 19, 2017 for restoration and rehabilitation of the single-family residence .

MM-3 If during plan review and/or construction related activities it is determined that modification(s) to the Rehabilitation Plan are necessary, the applicant shall modify the building permit plans and/or suspend work and contact the Planning Division of necessary changes. Prior to commencing work, the applicant shall update the Rehabilitation Plan and submit it to the Planning Division for review and approval.

2) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site has already been developed and disrupted. Any archaeological resources, which may have existed at one time (on or beneath the site), have likely been previously disturbed or destroyed. Nonetheless, construction activities associated with project implementation have the potential to unearth undocumented resources. In the event that archaeological resources are discovered during project subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius (328 feet) must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards Professional Qualification Standards has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is located within a heavily urbanized area and has been previously developed. No known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site or surrounding area. Furthermore, notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians on April 6, 2018, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public

Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within 30-days of the notice. Nonetheless, if human remains are encountered during excavation and grading activities, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC will then contact the most likely descendant of the deceased Native American, who will then serve as a consultant on how to proceed with the remains (i.e., avoid removal or rebury). With implementation of this standard requirement, no significant impact is anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

F. ENERGY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X	
2. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X	

1) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Less Than Significant Impact. The construction of the project would require consumption of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (including fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles and construction equipment, and other resources including, but not limited to, lumber, sand, gravel, asphalt, metals, and water. Construction would include energy used by construction equipment and other activities at the project site (e.g., building demolition, excavation, paving), in addition to the energy used to manufacture the equipment, materials, and supplies and transport them to the project site. Energy for maintenance activities would include day-to-day upkeep of equipment and systems, as well as energy embedded in any replacement equipment, materials, and supplies. It is expected that nonrenewable energy resources would be used efficiently during construction and maintenance activities given the financial implications of inefficient use of such resources. Therefore, the amount and rate of consumption of such resources during construction and maintenance activities would not result in the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of energy resources.

Operation of the project would involve consumption of electricity and natural gas; however, these resources are already consumed on the project site, and an incremental increase in the consumption of these resources associated with the project operation would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources. The project would be designed to comply with Title 24 Building, Energy, and Green Buildings Standards (California Building Code, Title 24, Parts 4, 6 and 11); therefore, the project consumption of energy resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less Than Significant Impact. As described above, the new multi-family residential building's energy efficiency would, at a minimum, comply with the California Energy Code and the California Building Code. As such, the project would not conflict with or obstruct state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

G. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X	
3. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X	
4. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X	
5. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				X
6. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X	

1) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other

substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

Less Than Significant Impact. According to the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not within an established Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone for surface fault rupture hazards. Based on the available geologic data, active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are not known to be located directly beneath or projecting toward the project site. Therefore, impacts from the rupture of a seismic fault are considered to be less than significant.

***Mitigation Measures*:** No mitigation measures are required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site could be subject to strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake originating along one of the faults listed as active or potentially active in the Southern California area. This hazard exists throughout Southern California and could pose a risk to public safety and property by exposing people, property, or infrastructure to potentially adverse effects, including strong seismic ground shaking. Compliance with applicable building codes would minimize structural damage to buildings and ensure safety in the event of a moderate or major earthquake. Therefore, impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

No Impact. As identified in the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone. Therefore, no impacts related to liquefaction would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. As identified in the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within a mapped landside hazard zone. Therefore, no impacts related to landslides would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activity associated with the proposed project development may result in wind and water driven erosion of soils due to grading activities if soil is stockpiled or exposed during construction. However, this impact is considered short-term in nature since the site would expose small amounts of soil during construction activities. Further, as part of the proposed project, the applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the Glendale Municipal Code Section 13.42.060 to prepare and administer a plan that effectively provides for a minimum stormwater quality protection throughout project construction. The plan would incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to less than significant. In addition, the applicant would be required to adhere to South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 403—Fugitive Dust, which would further reduce the impact related to soil erosion to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an onsite or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less Than Significant Impact. As identified in the City's Safety Element (August 2003), the project site is not located within a mapped liquefaction hazard zone. The relatively flat topography of the project site precludes both stability problems and the potential for lurching, which is earth movement at right angles to a cliff or steep slope during ground shaking. As previously discussed, the project is not subject to hazards such as landslides and liquefaction.

Ground surface subsidence generally results from the extraction of fluids or gas from the subsurface that can result in a gradual lowering of the ground level. No regional subsidence as a result of groundwater pumping has been reported in the Glendale area. Therefore, the potential for ground collapse and other adverse effects due to subsidence on the project site is considered low.

In order to minimize damage due to geologic hazards, design and construction of the proposed project would comply with applicable building codes. Therefore, impacts related to exposure to hazards including landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction and collapse would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Less Than Significant Impact. The soils underlying the project site and surrounding area are considered to have a low expansion potential. In addition, development of the project will be required to comply with applicable building codes which would minimize structural damage to buildings and ensure safety in the event of a moderate or major earthquake. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No Impact. Septic tanks will not be used for the proposed project. The proposed project would connect to and use the existing sewage conveyance system. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

6) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less Than Significant Impact. Plant and animal fossils are typically found within sedimentary rock deposits. Most of the City of Glendale consists of igneous and metamorphic rock, and the local area is not known to contain paleontological resources. Nonetheless, paleontological resources may possibly exist at deep levels and could be unearthed with implementation of the project. In the event that paleontological resources are unearthed during the project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a paleontologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, less than significant impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

H. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
2. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	

1) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. GHG as defined under AB 32 includes: carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020 by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under CEQA. The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has prepared the region's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), which is part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Glendale has an adopted Greener

Glendale Plan which meets regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by SCAG and adopted by the ARB. The Greener Glendale Plan uses land use development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, transportation measures and other policies that are determined to be feasible to reduce GHG.

At this time no air agency, including the SCAQMD, has adopted applicable project-level significance thresholds for GHGs emissions. AB 32 did not set a significance threshold for GHG emissions, although EPA, CARB or another agency may issue regulations at some point which may set forth significance criteria for CEQA analysis. In the interim, none of the CEQA Guidelines, the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the Air Quality Management Plan, or the SCAQMD set forth applicable significance thresholds for GHG emissions.

Due to the complex physical, chemical and atmospheric mechanisms involved in global climate change, there is no basis for concluding that the project's very small and essentially temporary (primarily from construction) increase in emissions could cause a measurable increase in global GHG emissions necessary to force global climate change.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) clarifies that the effects of GHG emissions are cumulative and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA's requirements for cumulative impact analysis. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4 recommends consideration of qualitative factors that may be used in the determination of significance, including the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a reduction or mitigation of GHGs. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(h)(3), a project 's incremental contribution to a cumulative impact can be found not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with an approved plan or mitigation program that provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem within the geographic area of the project. Examples of such programs include "plans or regulations for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions."

Since this project is consistent with Greener Glendale Strategies to reduce GHGs and the SCS prepared by SCAG consequently, this project would result in a less than cumulatively considerable impact on GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less Than Significant Impact. For the reasons discussed in Response H.1 above, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

I. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
4. 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 it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
6. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
7. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X

1) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant Impact. Searches of the Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database and California State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database indicated no contamination on the project site. The federal government banned consumer use of lead-based paint (LBP) in 1978 and many, but not all, asbestos-containing materials (ACM) were banned in construction products in 1989. As the existing dwellings on the project site were constructed between 1913 and 1928, prior to the ban of these materials, it is possible that they contain LBP or ACMs. In addition, other regulated materials such as fluorescent lights may be present.

The proposed project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. As such, the existing structures are required to be tested in accordance with applicable rules and regulations and remediated accordingly prior to demolition. The project would be required to comply with all applicable rules established by the SCAQMD, including Rule 403 and 402, during the construction phase of the project that would prevent dust from migrating beyond the project site. Compliance with the applicable rules and regulations would ensure that significant impacts are reduced to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would include demolition activities prior to new construction. Given the age of the structures on site, LBP and ACMs may be encountered during demolition activities. Project construction would be required to comply with applicable state regulations regarding LBP work practices, including testing and abatement. The removal of ACMs would be subject to the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 1403, which governs work practice requirements for asbestos in all renovation and demolition activities. Rule 1403 includes an onsite survey and notification requirements prior to beginning a project, as well as work practice standards and disposal requirements.

Additionally, under California law, fluorescent lamps cannot be disposed as municipal waste. Fluorescent tubes and bulbs may be managed as universal wastes under Title 22, Chapter 23 of the California Code of Regulations and are typically recycled. With adherence to applicable regulations, project impacts related to removal of hazardous materials during demolition would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

No Impact. There are two public schools located approximately one quarter of mile and one-half mile from the subject site. Allan F. Daily High School is located at 222 North Jackson Street and R.D. White Elementary School is located at 744 East Doran Street. However, the project would not emit any new hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials since residential uses are proposed. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) 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 it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

No Impact. The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact. The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would occur.

***Mitigation Measures*:** No mitigation measures are required.

6) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. There is no "City Disaster Response Route" located on any streets adjacent to the project site. The nearest designated street is Brand Boulevard, as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element (August 2003). The proposed project does not involve any changes to Brand Boulevard, nor would the project result in the alteration of an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. As such, no impacts to emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans would occur as a result of the proposed project. No impact would occur.

***Mitigation Measures*:** No mitigation measures are required.

7) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

No Impact. The project site and surrounding area are characterized by features typical of the urban landscape. The project site is not within a fire hazard area as identified in the City of Glendale General Plan Safety Element. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

J. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface of groundwater quality?			X	
2. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:			X	
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;			X	
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;			X	
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or			X	
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X	
4. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X

1) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface of groundwater quality?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project would be required to comply with all NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) requirements including pre-construction, during construction and post-construction Best Management Practices (BMPs). In addition, the project will be required to submit an approved SUSMP (Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan) to be integrated into the design of the project. As a result of the NPDES and SUSMP requirements, impacts associated with water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City currently utilizes water from Glendale Water and Power (GWP), which relies on primarily importing water from the Metropolitan Water District, some local groundwater basins and from the San Fernando Basin. Consequently, implementation of the proposed project would result in development that could indirectly require a slight increased use of groundwater through the provision of potable water by GWP; however, as discussed in Response S-2 below, the proposed project's water demand is within water projections. As a result, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies.

Per the City's Open Space and Conservation Element, the north and easterly facing slopes of the Verdugo Mountains drain into the Arroyo Verdugo drainage basin and directly feed aquifers and wells reserved exclusively for the City of Glendale. The south-facing slopes of these mountains drain into the Los Angeles River basin which feed aquifers, ground water basins and wells shared by the Cities of Glendale, Burbank and Los Angeles. The largest flood control basin is the Verdugo basin, which is located adjacent to the Oakmont Country Club in the northern portion of the city. Maps 4-21 and 4-22 of the Open Space and Conservation Element show this, as well the other basins, within the city. Per Maps 4-21 and 4-22, the subject property is not located on or within the watershed or aquifer recharge areas. No significant impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is situated on two flat lots and developed with one single-family dwelling unit on each lot. Water that falls on the site either is absorbed into the ground on-site or flows into existing city streets and drains. The applicant would be required to adhere to conditions under the NPDES (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) Permit set forth by the RWQCB (Regional Water Quality Control Board), and to prepare and submit a SWPPP (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan) to be administered throughout proposed project construction. The SWPPP would incorporate BMPs (Best Management Practices) to ensure that potential water quality impacts from water-driven erosion during construction would be reduced to a less than significant level.

The proposed project would not change the existing drainage pattern of the site significantly. All subsequent runoff would be conveyed via streets and gutters to storm drain locations around the project site. Development of the proposed project would not require any substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area, nor would it significantly affect the capacity of the existing storm drain system. In addition, in accordance with Chapter 13.42, of the Glendale Municipal Code, a Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) containing design features and BMPs to reduce post-construction pollutants in stormwater discharges would be required as part of the project. Impacts are considered to be less than significant as a result of the conditions and measures required by the NPDES permit, SWPPP and SUSMP.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

Less Than Significant Impact. There are no natural drainage features on or near the project site. The project site, in its existing condition, is occupied with the existing two dwelling units. Almost half of the lot is landscaped, which is an approximately 7,500 square-foot landscaped area. Construction activities would entail grading, excavation, and other ground-disturbing activities, which could temporarily alter surface drainage patterns and increase the potential for flooding, erosion, or siltation. However, the project would be required to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit, which would require implementation of BMPs and erosion control measures, thereby reducing the effects of construction activities on erosion and drainage patterns. The project will include a smaller landscaped area (approximately 4,220 square feet) and the amount of hardscape on the property, covered by the building footprints, will be increased slightly. However, the project will not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in a flooding on or off-site.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above (Response J-3.ii), post-construction stormwater runoff would increase an insignificant amount because the amount of landscaping at the project site will decrease from approximately 7,500 square feet to 4,220 square feet (approximately

3,280 square-foot decrease). Therefore, impacts relating to increased runoff to less than significant levels.

With respect to water quality, as described above in Response I-1, with implementation of BMPs mandated by the MS4 (municipal separate storm sewer systems) permit, SWQMP, and construction-related NPDES permit, water quality impacts associated with project construction and operation would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

Less Than Significant Impact. According to Plate P-2 by the City's Safety Element, the project site is not located within a Dam Inundation Zone that would be inundated during the failure of an up-gradient water reservoir or dam. Additionally, FEMA Flood Maps do not identify the project site to be located within a 100-year flood zone. The project site is located with flood Zone X with a 0.2-percent annual chance of flooding or a 1-percent annual chance of flooding with an average depth of less than 1 foot. Therefore, less-than-significant flood-related impacts would occur in association with construction and operation of the project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

No Impact. Seiches are typically caused when strong winds and rapid changes in atmospheric pressure push water from one end of a body of water to the other, causing the water to oscillate back and forth for hours or even days. The proposed project site is not located downslope of any large body of water that would produce a seiche. Tsunamis are large ocean waves generated by sudden water displacement caused by a submarine earthquake, landslide, or volcanic eruption. A review of the County of Los Angeles Flood and Inundation Hazards Map indicates that the site is not within the mapped tsunami inundation boundaries. Last, the project location is not located in an area susceptible to mudflow due to proximity to slopes. Surrounding the project site are other residential zoned properties with single-family and multi-family dwellings. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

No Impact. The project site is not located within a mapped groundwater basin. The project would be required to comply with the Phase 1 MS4 permit requiring runoff to be treated using LID treatment controls, such as bio-treatment facilities and other hydro-modification features, to improve stormwater quality, and NPDES requiring the development and implementation of a SWPPP, which describes BMPs to control erosion and water quality. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact as it would not conflict with a water quality control plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

K. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community?				X
2. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	

1) Physically divide an established community?

No Impact. The project site is located on an infill site, which currently contains two residential dwelling units. The project involves the demolition of an existing one-story dwelling (located at 538 North Kenwood Street), the preservation and rehabilitation of an existing two-story dwelling (located at 534 North Kenwood Street), and construction of 11-unit apartment building for a total of 12 units. The project site includes two adjoining lots totaling 15,000 square feet (0.34 acres) and is surrounded by developed lots containing multi-family and single-family buildings in a high-density residential zone. The proposed project is consistent with the development pattern in the area and is permitted use in the R-1250 zone. No established community would be divided as a result of the project. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Less Than Significant Impact. The zoning designation on the project site is R-1250 (High Density Residential) and the General Plan designation is High Density Residential. The Zoning Code allows up to 15 multi-family residential units to be constructed on the site using the density for a lot width of 90 feet or greater; however, the project consists of development of only 12 multi-family residential units (including the existing dwelling unit on-site). The proposed project complies with the Land Use Element of the General Plan, as well as the zoning standards including density, height, landscape/open space, setbacks, and parking; however, development of the project requires approval of an Administrative Exception to allow for a 2.48 percent increase (363 square feet) in the maximum allowable lot coverage (50 percent maximum lot coverage is allowed in R-1250 zone). The project will preserve the existing Aeroplane Craftsman style dwelling, which is considered a historic resource in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This would create space restriction on the site and limit the buildable area on the project site. The proposed 52.48 percent lot coverage would allow reasonable development of the site while preserving the existing historic dwelling. The project will be reviewed by the Design Review Board per Glendale Municipal Code Section 30.47, to ensure compatibility with surrounding environment. As a result, no significant impacts associated with applicable land use plans and policies would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

L. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
2. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

1) 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?

No Impact. The project site located in an area that is completely urbanized for many years and is not within an area that has been identified as containing valuable mineral resources, as indicated in the City's Open Space and Conservation Element (January 1993). Therefore, development within the project site would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

No Impact. As indicated in Response L-1 above, there are no known mineral resources within the project site. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

M. NOISE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
2. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
3. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

1) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project involves demolition of the existing residence (located at 538 North Kenwood Street), preservation and rehabilitation of the existing single-family residence (located at 534 North Kenwood Street), and construction of 11 new, multi-family dwelling units. The total number of dwelling units on-site will be 12. This is a permitted use on the subject property, which is zoned R-1250 (High Density Residential). Surrounding land uses include multi-family complexes and some remaining single-family residences. As shown in the City's Noise Element, the project site is located within the 70 CNEL and over projected 2030 noise contours. The new project would be constructed to reduce interior noise to acceptable levels. All development within the project site would be constructed consistent with the State of California Building Code and would be required to comply with the City of Glendale Noise Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 8.36) which prohibits construction activities to between the hours of 7:00 p.m. on one day and 7:00 a.m. of the next day or from 7:00 p.m. on Saturday to 7:00 a.m. on Monday or from 7:00 p.m. preceding a holiday. Compliance with the City's noise ordinance would ensure that noise impacts will be less than significant. In addition, short-term construction noise levels are not expected to exceed the standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. While the proposed building will produce a more intensive use than the existing condition, it is not anticipated to generate noise in excess of the limits contained in the Noise Element. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less Than Significant Impact. Excessive groundborne vibration is typically associated with activities such as blasting used in mining operations, or the use of pile drivers during construction. The proposed project would be constructed using typical construction techniques. No pile driving for construction would be necessary. Thus, significant vibration impacts would not occur.

Heavy construction equipment (e.g. bulldozer and excavator) would generate a limited amount of ground-borne vibration during construction activities at short distances away from the source. The use of equipment would most likely be limited to a few hours spread over several days during demolition/grading activities. Post-construction on-site activities would be limited to mechanical equipment (e.g., air handling unit and exhaust fans) that would not generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise. As such, ground-borne vibration and noise levels associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact. The Project site is neither located within an airport land use plan nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

N. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

1) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No Impact. The proposed project involves demolition of the existing residence located at 538 North Kenwood Street, preservation and rehabilitation of the existing single-family residence located at 534 North Kenwood Street, and construction of 11 multi-family dwelling units. The total number of dwelling units on-site will be 12. As a result of the proposed project, there will be a net increase of 10 residential dwelling units. The subject site is zoned R-1250 (High Density Residential Zone) with a General Plan Land Use Designation of High Density Residential. The subject site is surrounded by other multi-family and single-family residences. The project is consistent with the zoning and land use designation of the area and the project is less than the allowable density for the zoning (15 units). Therefore, development of the project site would not induce population growth. No impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. No housing or residential populations would be displaced by development of the proposed project since the development of the project would result in net increase of 10 housing units (the total number of dwelling units on-site will be 12) and the proposed project will not displace any occupants, as the existing dwellings are currently vacant. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No further mitigation measures are required.

O. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities,				

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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:				
a) Fire protection?			X	
b) Police protection?			X	
c) Schools?			X	
d) Parks?			X	
e) Other public facilities?			X	

1) 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:

a) Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The City of Glendale Fire Department (GFD) provides fire and paramedic services to the project site. The nearest fire station is Station No. 25, located at 353 North Chevy Chase Dr., which is approximately 1.1 miles from the project site. The project will be required to comply with the Uniform Fire Code, including installation of fire sprinklers for the new dwelling units, and to submit plans to the Glendale Fire Department at the time building plans are submitted for approval. Impacts to fire protection are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

b) Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact. The Glendale Police Department (GPD) provides police services to the project site. The nearest police facility is located at 131 North Isabel Street, which is about 0.6 miles from the subject property. The proposed project will add a net gain of 10 residential dwelling units to the area, as well as the people who will live in these units. The site is located in an urban, developed area of the city. The additional population that this project will bring is anticipated to have less than significant impact to Police services.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

c) Schools?

Less Than Significant Impact. Section 65995 of the Government Code provides that school districts can collect a fee on a per square foot basis for new residential units or additions to existing units to assist in the construction of or additions to schools. Such fee will be collected prior to the issuance of a building permit. Payment of these fees under the provisions of Government Code

Section 65995.5 reduces impacts that could occur as a result of the project to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

d) Parks?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project would not involve the development or displacement of a park. The subject property and surrounding area is zoned for high density multi-family residential development and was not planned for use as a park. The project would provide landscape areas/open space in the front, side, and rear yards, as well as the courtyard, which will fulfill the landscape/open space requirement per the R-1250 zoning requirements. The total landscape/open space is 4,220 square feet. The proposed project would not result in a significant contribution to additional need for parks due to the minimal net increase of new dwelling units. Additionally, the proposed project would be subject to the park and library development impact fees. Such fees will be collected prior to the issuance of development permits. Impacts to parks are anticipated to be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

e) Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. The project site is presently developed with two single-family residential units. Development of the site will result in a net increase of 10 residential units. The lots surrounding this site are developed with similar or larger multi-family residential buildings, with the exception of a few remaining single-family residences. Several public facilities are located within close proximity and walking distance of the project site. These facilities include Wilson Mini-Park, Doran Gardens Mini-Park, and Piedmont Mini-Park. The additional dwelling units that this project will provide can be adequately served by existing public facilities, including libraries. No significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

P. RECREATION

Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			**X**	
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			**X**	

1) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Less Than Significant Impact. The incremental increase of residents to the city occupying the project's 12 units (net increase of 10 from the existing condition), is not expected to generate a substantial increase in demand for existing park or recreational facilities due to the small net increase of new residential dwelling units. As discussed in Response O-1.d above, the project applicant will be required to pay the City's Park and Library Development Impact Fee to provide for park and recreation facilities based on the current fee schedule for residential development prior to the issuance of building permit. Payment of the impact fee would result in a less than significant impact to park and recreational facilities.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact. As indicated in Response P-1 above, the project is not anticipated to significantly increase the demand on existing parks. No significant impacts to recreation resources are anticipated with implementation of the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

Q. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X	
2. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X	
3. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X	
4. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X

1) Conflict with program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities for the proposed project would generate additional traffic as a result of employee vehicle trips and construction truck transport of equipment and building material during construction period. The increase in day time traffic is not considered substantial since the construction phase is short-term, approximately 18 months and will not exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project

To ensure all construction traffic impacts (including construction worker trips and truck traffic for material delivery and material import/export) are less than significant during construction, a Construction Traffic Management Plan will be prepared and submitted to the City's Public Works Department for approval. The Construction Traffic Management Plan will include a Construction

Traffic Control Plan, a Construction Parking Plan, a Haul Routes Plan, and construction hours. As a result, construction traffic impacts would be less than significant.

The proposed project would result in a net increase of 10 residential units above the current condition. The project would not conflict with any program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities as the slight increase in the number of vehicles using the area streets resulting from the project is anticipated to create a less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) **Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?**

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed above in Response Q-1, the proposed project would not result in any significant increase in traffic on the area roadway network. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) ***Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

Less Than Significant Impact. As discussed in Q-1 above, a Construction Traffic Control plan approved by the Glendale Public Works Department will be required prior to construction. The plan is required to identify all traffic control measures, signs, and delineators to be implemented by the construction contractor. The plan will also identify contractor information, hours of construction, construction worker parking information, as well as the proposed haul route. There would not be any access by the general public to the construction site and the disposal of demolition materials and export of soil/material will not interfere with public streets. In addition, the proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing roadway network. No significant impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) ***Result in inadequate emergency access?***

No Impact. No changes to the existing roadway network are proposed as a result of the project. Direct access to the property will be taken from Kenwood Street, which is a designed as a Community Collector in the City's Circulation Element. As indicated in Section Q-1 above, a traffic control plan will be required for the construction phase of the project. The plan will be reviewed and approved by the City's Engineering Division to ensure that emergency access is not impacted during construction, nor is the City's Disaster Response Route impacted. As a result, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required

R. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less Than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined				

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in the local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or			X	
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X	

1) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in te1rms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and this is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or

Less Than Significant Impact. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of notice. The project site and surrounding area are not known to contain tribal cultural resources. Nonetheless, resources may possibly exist and could be unearthed with implementation of the project. In the event that tribal cultural resources are unearthed during the project-related subsurface activities, all earth-disturbing work within a 100-meter radius must be temporarily suspended or redirected until a representative from the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians has been contacted and evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. With implementation of this standard requirement, less than significant impact would occur.

***Mitigation Measures*:** No mitigation measures are required.

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Less Than Significant Impact: As mentioned previously, no known burial sites exist within the vicinity of the project site and surrounding area. Therefore, the potential for impact on known human remains or a resource determined to be significant by a California Native American tribe is low. No resources have been identified on the project site pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. Written notice was given to the Fernandeno Tataviam of Mission Indians and Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians, as required by AB 52 and codified in Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 et seq. Consultation was not requested by either tribe within the 30-days of notice. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

***Mitigation Measures*:** No mitigation measures are required.

S. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1 Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
2. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X	
3. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				X
4. Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X	
5. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

1) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact. Under Section 401 of the CWA, the RWQCB issues NPDES permits to regulate waste discharged to "waters of the nation," which includes reservoirs, lakes, and their tributary waters. Waste discharges include discharges of stormwater and construction related discharges. Construction projects are also required to prepare a SWPPP. In addition, the proposed project would be required to submit an SUSMP to mitigate urban stormwater runoff. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the project applicant would be required to satisfy the requirements related to the payment of fees and/or the provisions of adequate wastewater facilities. The proposed project would comply with the RWCQB-established waste discharge prohibitions and water quality objectives,

which will be incorporated into the proposed project as a project design feature. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would require the use of water for dust control and cleanup purposes. The use of water during construction would be short term in nature. Therefore, construction activities are not considered to result in a significant impact on the existing water system or available water supplies.

Future water demand in the city is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. The total water demand in 2020 in the City of Glendale is expected to be 28,182 acre feet per year (afy) with a total available supply of 39,540 afy.

Normal Weather Conditions

The City of Glendale has identified an adequate supply of water to meet future city demands under normal conditions. As indicated in the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, a surplus exists that provides a reasonable buffer of approximately 1,500 to 2,500 afy of water. Future water demand in the city is based on projected development contained in the General Plan. For purposes of this assessment, the demand of the proposed project was assumed to have been included in this demand projection. Therefore, with the addition of 2.8 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there will be ample supply to meet remaining city demand under normal conditions.

Dry Weather Conditions

Water supplies from the San Fernando and Verdugo Basins and recycled water would potentially be affected by drought conditions. If there is a shortage in water supply from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (MWD), the City of Glendale's distribution system could be affected. However, MWD's completion of the Diamond Valley Reservoir near Hemet added to the reliability of MWD's supplies. This reservoir plus other MWD storage/banking operations increases the reliability of MWD to meet demands. MWD is also proposing contracts with its member agencies to supply water, including supply during drought conditions. These contracts would define the MWD's obligation to provide "firm" water supply to the city.

It is anticipated that during any 3-year drought, the city would have sufficient water supply to meet demand. According to the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, the city would use less MWD water supplies in the future compared to its current use. With the city's reduction of dependency on imported water from MWD, GWP has a higher level of reliability in meeting water demands during drought conditions. Even with the addition of 2.24 afy of demand generated by the proposed project, there is sufficient supply to meet city demand under drought conditions.

The proposed project complies with the land use designation of the General Plan. The proposed project would result in an increase of 10 residential units. Based on a generation factor of 200 gallons/unit per day (gpd), the project would result in a demand of approximately 2,000 gpd or 2.24 acre feet per year (afy) of water.

In addition, the project would be required to comply with the provisions of Glendale's Mandatory Water Conservation Ordinance, as well as the 2016 California Green Building Standards (CAL

Green) of the Glendale Green Building Code and the water conserving fixture and fittings requirements per the current California Plumbing Code. All new buildings must utilize higher efficiency plumbing fixtures (low-flush toilets, low-flow showerheads and faucets) and automatic irrigation system controllers based on water or soil moisture, and demonstrate an indoor net reduction in the consumption of potable water.

As discussed above, the city would continue to have adequate supply to meet citywide demand under normal and drought conditions with the proposed project. As a result, long-term impacts to water supply during operation of the proposed project under both normal and drought conditions would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

No Impact. Sewage from the City of Glendale is treated by the City of Los Angeles Hyperion System, which includes the Los Angeles/Glendale Water Reclamation Plant (LAGWRP), located outside the Glendale City limits in Los Angeles, and the Hyperion Treatment Plant, located in Playa del Rey. The City of Glendale and the City of Los Angeles jointly own and share operating capacity of LAGWRP. The City of Glendale entered into an amalgamated treatment and disposal agreement (Amalgamated Agreement) with the City of Los Angeles, which eliminates entitlements and reduces limitations on the amount of sewage discharged into the Hyperion system. Any City of Glendale sewage not treated at the LAGWRP is treated at the Hyperion Treatment Plant (HTP).

The HTP has a dry-weather design capacity of 450 million gpd and is currently operating below that capacity, at 362 million gpd. As a result, adequate capacity exists to treat the proposed project-generated effluent. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the expansion or construction of sewage treatment facilities. No impact would result with regard to impacts to the available sewage treatment capacity.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less Than Significant Impact. Implementation of the proposed project would result in an increase in residential development on- site. Solid waste generated on the project site would be deposited at the Scholl Canyon Landfill, which is owned by the City of Glendale, or one of the landfills located within the County of Los Angeles. The annual disposal rate at the Scholl Canyon facility is approximately 340,000 tons per year. Combined with the increase in solid waste generated by the proposed project, the Scholl Canyon facility could accommodate the annual disposal amount. In addition, because the proposed project would be required to implement a waste-diversion program aimed at reducing the amount of solid waste disposed in the landfill, the amount of solid waste generated would be less than the amount estimated. Examples of waste diversion efforts would include recycling programs for cardboard boxes, paper, aluminum cans, and bottles through the provision of recycling containers. As a result, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

5) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. The project will comply with all federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. All construction debris will be disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local statutes, including Glendale Municipal Code Chapter 8.58. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

T. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, *would the project:*	**Potentially Significant Impact**	**Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated**	**Less than Significant Impact**	**No Impact**
1. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				**X**
2. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				**X**
3. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel, breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				**X**
4. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				**X**

1) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) maps show areas of significant fire hazards based on fuels, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors, pursuant to Public Resources Code 4201-4204 and Government Code 51175-51189. These areas are referred to as Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZs) and are identified for areas where the state has financial responsibility for wildland fire protection (i.e., state responsibility areas, or SRAs), and areas where local governments have financial responsibility for wildland fire protection (i.e., local responsibility areas, or LRAs).

There are three FHSZ mapped for SRAs (moderate, high, and very high), while only lands zoned as very high are identified in LRAs (CAL FIRE 2007). The project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. As a result, no impact would occur related to wildfire hazards, including emergency response/evacuation, pollutants and uncontrolled wildfire spread, associated infrastructure, or post-fire effects.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

2) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, the project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur related to wildfire hazards due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel, breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

No Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur related to the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

4) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

No Impact. As indicated in Response T-1 above, project site is not located within a LRA and is not located near a SRA or a very high FHSZ. No impacts would occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

U. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Does the project have the potential to substantial 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, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			X	
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)			X	
3. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X	

1) Does the project have the potential to substantial 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, substantially 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?

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project is located in a developed and highly urbanized area. No biological species or habitat for biological species exists on site or within the project vicinity. In addition, no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved habitat conservation plans apply to the project site. As such, the proposed project would not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The existing two-story Aeroplane Craftsman Style dwelling unit on-site (built in 1913), which is identified as individually eligible for local register and considered a historic resource pursuant to Section 15064.5(a) of the California Quality Environmental Act (CEQA), will be preserved and rehabilitated onsite as part of the proposed development. Mitigation measures have been added to the project requiring that all work to comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties and shall follow the treatment and rehabilitation plan prepared and submitted by Sapphos Environmental, Inc. (dated May 19, 2017) for restoration and rehabilitation of the subject dwelling unit. If during plan review and/or construction related activities it is determined that modification(s) to the Rehabilitation Plan are necessary, the applicant shall modify the building permit plans and/or suspend work and contact the Planning Division of necessary changes. Prior to commencing work, the applicant shall update the Rehabilitation Plan and submit it to the Planning Division for review and approval. Staff site inspection will be required prior to final building inspection. With the implementation of these measures, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required. See response provided under Section E-1.

2) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less Than Significant Impact. Cumulative impacts may occur when the proposed project in conjunction with one or more related projects would yield an impact that is greater than what would occur with the development of only the proposed project. Considering the proposed project is less than the allowable densities in accordance with the zoning code (12 units where 15 units are allowed), the incremental effect of the new multi-family residential building is not cumulatively considerable. All environmental issues considered in this Initial Study were found to have either no impact, a less than significant impact or less than significant impact with mitigations incorporated. As discussed in Section H (Greenhouse Gas Emissions), the project would not exceed State or regional thresholds for the emission of criteria air pollutants or greenhouse gases. With implementation of mitigation measures for impacts associated with cultural resources and biological resources, impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Development of the project will not substantially increase traffic nor would it result in a substantial increase in population. Public facilities are available to accommodate the slight increase in usage due to the increase in population. Therefore, no cumulative impact to these resources would occur. Impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials are generally confined to a specific site and do not affect off-site areas. Therefore, the

proposed project would have not cumulatively considerable effects, and as such, cumulative impacts would not occur.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

3) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact. Development of the proposed project would not create direct and indirect adverse effects on humans. Many of the less than significant impacts that were identified are considered short-time effects and no significant impacts are anticipated. In addition, potential impacts associated with cultural resources and biological resources have been mitigated to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are required.

13. Earlier Analyses

None

14. Project References Used to Prepare Initial Study Checklist

One or more of the following references were incorporated into the Initial Study by reference, and are available for review in the Community Development Department, 633 E. Broadway, Rm. 103, Glendale, CA 91206-4386. Items used are referred to by number on the Initial Study Checklist.

1. Environmental Information Form and materials submitted on March 20, 2018.
2. "Design Review and Rehabilitation Plan for 534 N. Kenwood Street, Glendale, CA 91201", dated May 19, 2017, prepared by Sapphos Environmental, Inc.
3. The City of Glendale's Municipal Code, as amended.
4. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Safety Element" (August 2003).
5. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Noise Element" *(*May 2007).
6. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Recreation Element" (April 1996).
7. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Land Use Element" (October 23, 1986).
8. The City of Glendale's *General Plan*, "Open Space and Conservation Element", as amended.
9. City of Glendale 's "Reconnaissance Survey and Historic Context statement of Craftsman Style Architecture", (October 2007).
10. City of Glendale 's South Community Plan, "South Glendale Historic Resource Survey" (June 2018).
11. California Emissions Estimator Module (CalEEMod version 2016.3.2) Report.
12. California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program,* Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2010 (September 2011).
13. California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, *Special Publication 42* (Revised 1997, Supplements 1 and 2 added 1999).

14. South Coast Air Quality Management District, *Guidance Document for Addressing Air Quality Issues in General Plans and Local Planning* (May 2005).
15. California Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State of California General Plan Guidelines (October 2003).
16. City of Glendale, "Green Glendale Plan" (March 27, 2012).
17. City of Glendale, "Zero Waste Action Plan" (2011).