

**PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 14-\_\_**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF GROVER BEACH  
RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF AN ADDENDUM TO THE NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR  
AMENDMENTS TO THE LOCAL COASTAL PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT CODE  
(DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION 11-12)**

**WHEREAS**, in February 2010, the City Council adopted a comprehensive update to the Land Use Element of the General Plan; and

**WHEREAS**, in August 2012, the City Council approved a Local Coastal Program (LCP) Amendment (Resolution 12-55) to bring it into conformance with the City's Land Use Element; and

**WHEREAS**, in October 2012, the City Council adopted the Development Code to replace the Zoning Code (Ordinance 12-06) to bring it into conformance with the City's Land Use Element; and

**WHEREAS**, approval of a LCP Amendment by the California Coastal Commission is required for the Amendment to take effect for the revisions to the Local Coastal Program and the adoption of the Development Code, which is the implementation plan for the City's Local Coastal Program; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Grover Beach has prepared an Addendum to the Negative Declaration for the proposed Amendment attached as Exhibit A; and

**WHEREAS**, the public notice has been given in the time and manner required by State law and City code; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission of the City of Grover Beach has reviewed and considered the Addendum to the Negative Declaration associated with Development Application 11-12 at Public Hearings on June 9 and June 24, 2014; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Grover Beach Planning Commission recommends the City Council makes the following finding:

1. An addendum to the previous Initial Study and Negative Declaration has been prepared for the amendment to Development Application 11-12 in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and determined in their independent judgment that the Amendment would not increase the severity of the impacts previously identified; therefore, the Amendment would not have a significant impact on the environment.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Planning Commission of the City of Grover Beach recommends that the City Council adopt the Addendum to the Negative Declaration relating to Development Application 11-12 as set forth in the attached Exhibit "A".

On motion by Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by Commissioner \_\_\_\_\_, and on the following roll-call vote, to wit:

AYES:  
NOES:  
ABSENT:  
ABSTAIN:

the foregoing RESOLUTION NO. 14-\_\_ was **PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED** at a Special Meeting of the City of Grover Beach Planning Commission on this 24<sup>th</sup> day of June 2014.

---

JOHN LAFERRIERE, CHAIR

Attest:

---

BRUCE BUCKINGHAM, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR  
SECRETARY TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Resolution 14-\_\_ Exhibit A

## **Development Application 11-12**

### **Local Coastal Program and Development Code Amendment**

Addendum to the Negative Declaration Previously  
Adopted by the City Council on August 6, 2012

**June 2014**

# SECTION 1

## INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

---

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The City Council, serving as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA), adopted a Negative Declaration on August 6, 2012 for an Amendment to the Local Coastal Program (LCP), Land Use Element, and Development Code (available for viewing at the Community Development Department). The project included a comprehensive update to the City's Zoning Code renamed Development Code (Article IX of the Municipal Code) and minor revisions to the Local Coastal Program (LCP) and Land Use Element to assure consistency among the three documents.

As discussed in the August 6, 2012 Negative Declaration, many potential impacts had previously been analyzed and mitigation measures implemented as part of the General Plan Land Use Element Master EIR certified on February 16, 2010 (available for viewing on the City's website at [www.grover.org](http://www.grover.org)), the 2007-2014 Housing Element Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on November 2, 2009 (available for viewing at the Community Development Department), and the Ramona Specific Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on July 5, 2005 (available for viewing at the Community Development Department).

The potential impacts that were analyzed in the August 6, 2012 Negative Declaration concluded that the proposed amendments could not have a significant effect on the environment and no mitigation measures were required.

The revisions to the LCP consist primarily of adding existing policies contained in the City's Land Use Element related to open space and resource conservation, promotion of visitor serving facilities and water quality. There are also a few new policies related to protection from coastal hazards (e.g., tsunamis, flooding, etc.) and protection of environmentally sensitive habitat areas.

The proposed revisions to the Development Code consist of clarifying that projects in the Coastal Zone must comply with the policies of the LCP, adding language regarding the protection of coastal resources, sensitive resources and coastal hazards, assuring coastal access and compliance with the Coastal Act, prohibiting large telecommunication facilities west of Highway 1, and other minor revisions.

The purpose of this review is to determine if the proposed amendments would create new significant impacts or increase the severity of impacts previously identified in the adopted Negative Declaration. Additional CEQA review beyond this Addendum would only be triggered if the proposed amendments create new significant impacts or impacts that are more severe than those disclosed in the adopted Negative Declaration.

According to CEQA Guidelines section 15162:

- (a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in light of the whole record, one or more of the following:
  - (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;

- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
  - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
  - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
  - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
  - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The Addendum need not be circulated for public review (CEQA Guidelines §15164(c)); however, an addendum is to be considered by the decision making body along with the previously adopted Negative Declaration prior to making a decision on the project (CEQA Guidelines 15164(d)). This Addendum to the adopted Negative Declaration demonstrates that the environmental analysis, and less than significant impacts identified in the adopted Negative Declaration for Development Application 11-12 remain substantively unchanged by the project modifications described herein, and supports the finding that the proposed project does not raise any new issues and does not exceed the levels of impact significance identified in the adopted Negative Declaration. Accordingly, a subsequent Negative Declaration or EIR is not necessary pursuant to §15164 of the CEQA *Guidelines*. Therefore, the City has elected not to prepare a Subsequent Negative Declaration or EIR pursuant to §15162 of the CEQA *Guidelines*. This decision is based on substantial evidence, as set forth in the following discussion of the proposed project modifications and the environmental impacts of those modifications.

## **1.2 SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS**

To reach the conclusions presented in this Addendum, the City conducted a comprehensive review of the proposed amendments to Development Application 11-12. The conclusions of this review are discussed in Section 2, which evaluates the proposed revisions and concludes that implementation of the proposed amendments would not result in a new significant impact or increase the severity of a previously identified impact than what was disclosed in the adopted Negative Declaration.

## **SECTION 2**

### **PROJECT MODIFICATIONS**

---

#### **2.1 PROJECT LOCATION**

The project is an amendment to the Local Coastal Program and Development Code which potentially affects properties City-wide.

#### **2.2 PROPOSED PROJECT MODIFICATIONS**

The proposed project is an amendment to the previous project and is limited to amendments to the Development Code and Local Coastal Program. There are no changes to the previously adopted Land Use Element. The proposed revisions to the LCP include the following:

- Adding existing Land Use Element policies to the Local Coastal Program related to open space and resource conservation, promotion of visitor serving facilities, and water quality.
- Adding new policies related to protection from coastal hazards (e.g., tsunamis, flooding, etc.), and protection of environmentally sensitive habitat areas,
- Revisions to reflect that there are no agricultural areas in the Coastal Zone.
- Other minor revisions that have no impact to the environment.

The proposed revisions to the Development Code include the following:

- Clarifying that projects in the Coastal Zone must comply with the policies of the LCP.
- Adding language regarding the protection of environmentally sensitive habitat areas, protection of coastal resources and protection from coastal hazards such as flooding.
- Assuring coastal access and compliance with the Coastal Act.
- Prohibiting large telecommunication facilities west of Highway 1.
- Restricting the expansion of non-conforming uses in the Coastal Zone.
- Other minor revisions that have no impact to the environment.

There are no changes to zoning boundaries or rezones and no changes to development standards (e.g., lot coverage, heights, setbacks, etc.), including increases to densities or intensification of uses.

#### **2.3 ORIGINAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The following is the original project description which describes the project in detail and the use of previous environmental studies:

The proposed project is a comprehensive update to the City's Zoning Code (Article IX of the Municipal Code). In February 2010, the Council adopted a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan Land Use Element. The Land Use Element contains broad land use policies that are implemented through the regulations and development standards contained in the City's

Zoning Code. As a result, the City's Zoning Code needs to be updated to incorporate the new policies of the Land Use Element. In February 2011, the Council adopted a Zoning Map amendment that brought a majority of the zoning into conformance with the Land Use Element (LUE).

This final step of updating the Zoning Code will bring it into full conformance with the LUE. There are also a few amendments to the Land Use Element. In addition, amendments are required to the Local Coastal Program (LCP) to reflect the changes to the LUE and Zoning Code. After final adoption of the Zoning Code update, an application will be submitted to the Coastal Commission for their review of the portions of the LUE and Zoning Code that affect development within the Coastal Zone, and the LCP amendments.

The last comprehensive update to the Zoning Code occurred in 1996. The proposed Zoning Code update is also a comprehensive update and involves a complete reorganization of the document to reduce its size and make it more user-friendly to find applicable information. The new format has also incorporated the City's subdivision and flood plain regulations, and sign ordinance, which were previously not part of the Zoning Code.

The Project Description for the Zoning Code update as been divided into three sections for purposes of analyzing the potential environmental impacts. The first section discusses the proposed changes that are consistent with the LUE update, Housing Element and Ramona Specific Plan. These changes have previously been evaluated as part of the environmental review for the respective projects. The second section discusses the proposed revisions that were not previously analyzed for potential environmental impacts. The third section discusses aspects of the proposed project that have no potential for impacts on the environment.

### **Impacts Previously Addressed**

The following proposed changes of the Zoning Code update have been previously analyzed and mitigation measures implemented as part of the General Plan Land Use Element Master EIR certified on February 16, 2010 (available for viewing on the City's website at [www.grover.org](http://www.grover.org)), the 2007-2014 Housing Element Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on November 2, 2009 (available for viewing at the Community Development Department), and the Ramona Specific Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration adopted on July 5, 2005 (available for viewing at the Community Development Department). Therefore, these revisions are not the focus of this Initial Study.

### Zoning Code Amendments

The following Zoning Code amendments are consistent with the environmental reviews for the Land Use and Housing Elements:

- Incorporate policies and programs contained in the 2010 Land Use Element update including: LU 3.1 (In-fill Development), LU 5.6 & 7.4 (Building Placement), LU 16.3 (Hillside Development), LU 20-8 (Residential Development), LU 20.9 (In-fill Development), and LU 16.5 (Design Standards for Natural Resources).
- Incorporate policies and programs contained in the 2009 Housing Element update including: HE 1.2.1 (Mixed Use), HE 1.2.3 (Farm Worker Housing) as HE 4.1.3 (Single Room Occupancy), 4.2.1 (Senior Housing), HE 4.6.1 (Reasonable Accommodations), HE 4.6.3 (Transitional & Supportive Housing), HE 5.2.1 (Demolition of Residential Structures), and HE 7.1.1 (Non-conforming Structures).
- Revise floor area ratio (FAR) and lot coverage development standards.

General Plan Map Amendments

The following General Plan Map amendments are consistent with the Ramona Specific Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration (reference Attached Map of Proposed Land Use Map Amendments indicating the locations).

	<b>General Location/Area</b>	<b>Current Land Use Designation</b>	<b>Proposed Land Use Designation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
7	247 North 9 <sup>th</sup> St.	High Density Residential	Public Facilities	Change consistent with Ramona Specific Plan. Corresponds to Zoning Map Amendment #13.

Zoning Map Amendments

The following Zoning Map amendments are consistent with the LUE and evaluated in the Master EIR for the LUE update (reference Attached Map of Proposed Zoning Map Amendments indicating the locations).

	<b>General Location/Area</b>	<b>Current Zone</b>	<b>Proposed Zone</b>	<b>Comments</b>
2	Nacimiento Avenue Mono Court Owens Court	MH	R1	Change consistent with LUE.
3	Laguna Court	RA	R-1	Change consistent with LUE.
4	1598 El Camino Real	RA	RC	Change consistent with LUE.
5	1783 to 1825 Farroll Rd. 920 to 975 Rose Court	RA	R1	Change consistent with LUE.
6	1465, 1483, 1499, 1591 Farroll Rd.	RA	R1	Change consistent with LUE.
8	Beckett Industrial area	CIC	CC	Change consistent with LUE.
10	202 South 3 <sup>rd</sup> St.	CI	CC	Change consistent with LUE.
11	South side of Ramona Ave. between 2 <sup>nd</sup> & 4 <sup>th</sup> Streets	CR2	CVS	Change consistent with LUE.
13	247 North 9 <sup>th</sup> St.	R3	PF	Change consistent with Ramona Specific Plan.
14	809 Ramona Ave.	CP	PF	Change consistent with Ramona Specific Plan.
15	South side of West Grand Ave. between 11 <sup>th</sup> & 12 <sup>th</sup> Streets	MU	CBO	Change consistent with LUE.
16	West Grand Ave. between 12 <sup>th</sup> & 14 <sup>th</sup> Streets	CS	CBO	Change consistent with LUE.
17	1345 to 1381 Long Branch Ave.	MU	CBO	Change consistent with LUE.
19	South side of Ramona Ave. between 14 <sup>th</sup> & 16 <sup>th</sup> Streets	MU	RC	Change consistent with LUE.

**Impacts Previously Not Addressed**

Zoning Code Amendments

The following Zoning Code amendments are proposed.

- Revised residential development standards in the coastal zone to make consistent with the non-coastal zones for lot coverage (increased in CR1 and CPR1 by 5%; decreased in R3 by 15%), building height (decreased in the CR3), setbacks (reduced in the CR2), and landscape coverage (increased in CR1 and CPR1 by 5%; decreased in CR3 by 5%). The proposed revisions would not allow increased density, but could allow a small increase and/or decrease in building size and footprint.

### General Plan Map Amendments

The following General Plan Map amendments are proposed (reference Attached Map of Proposed General Plan Map Amendments indicating the locations).

	<b>General Location/Area</b>	<b>Current Land Use Designation</b>	<b>Proposed Land Use Designation</b>	<b>Comments</b>
1	950 El Camino Real	Retail Commercial	Visitor Serving	Corresponds to Zoning Map Amendment #1.
2	1541 Hillcrest Ave.	Public Facilities	Low Density Residential	City owned lot for potential affordable housing. Change would make it consistent with proposed residential use and existing R1 zoning.
3	150 South Highway 1	Public Facilities	Visitor Serving	Corresponds to Zoning Map Amendment #9.
4	200 Block N. 4 <sup>th</sup> St.	Neighborhood Commercial	Medium & High Density Residential	Change based on previous Council direction.
5	South side of Ramona Ave. between 4 <sup>th</sup> & 5 <sup>th</sup> Streets	Visitor Serving	High Density Residential	Corresponds to Zoning Map Amendment #12.
5	South side of Ramona Ave. between 5 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Streets	Visitor Serving	High Density Residential	Corresponds to Zoning Map Amendment #12.
6	West Grand Ave. From 5 <sup>th</sup> to 6 <sup>th</sup> Streets	Visitor Serving	Central Business	Change consistent with the West Grand Avenue Master Plan.
8	Area bounded by 12 <sup>th</sup> & 14 <sup>th</sup> Sts. & Longbranch & Manhattan Aves.	Neighborhood Commercial & Low Density Residential	High Density Residential	Corresponds to Zoning Map Amendment #18.
9	1230 to 1293 South 4 <sup>th</sup> St.	Low Density Residential	Urban Reserve	Corresponds to Zoning Map Amendment #7.

General Plan map amendment #1 would result in a minor change to the types of commercial land uses, and would have the same development potential based on the development standards for the zones. Neither land use designation allows residential development. Therefore, there is no increase in the type or intensity of land uses allowed.

General Plan map amendment #2 would change the land use from Public Facilities to Low Density Residential and allow one residential unit on the site. This would be a decrease in the type and intensity of use from the potential development of public facilities.

General Plan map amendment #3 would change the land use from Public Facilities to Visitor Serving. This site is currently developed with the Amtrak train station. There would be no change to the existing use. Therefore, there would be no increase in the type or intensity of land use.

General Plan map amendments #4 and #5 would retain the 1992 land use designations of Medium and High Density Residential, eliminating the potential for future commercial development. This would be a decrease in the type and intensity of use approved in the 2010 LUE update.

General Plan map amendment #6 would change the type of commercial land uses, but would have the same development potential based on the development standards for the zones. The maximum residential for both land use designations is 20 du/ac. Therefore, there is no increase in the type or intensity of land uses allowed.

General Plan map amendment #8 would change the land use from Neighborhood Commercial – Mixed Use to High Density Residential. The change would eliminate the potential for commercial development and increase the residential density from 9 du/ac to 20 du/ac. The traffic generation for a 1,000 square foot residential unit would be significantly less than generated by 1,000 square feet of commercial use. Therefore, the proposed change in land use would have reduced impacts associated with traffic, air quality, etc. Therefore, this would be a decrease in the type and intensity of use approved in the 2010 LUE update. The alternative for Medium Density Residential would further reduce the density to 9 du/ac, and the associated impacts. If the alternative land use designation of Neighborhood Commercial is selected, this would be consistent with the LUE update and the associated Master EIR prepared for the project.

General Plan map amendment # 9 would change the land use from Low Density Residential (5 du/ac) to Urban Reserve. The Urban Reserve land use requires the preparation of a specific plan to determine the ultimate use of the property. Therefore, there is no increase in the type or intensity of land uses allowed.

#### Zoning Map Amendments

The following Zoning Map amendments are proposed (reference Attached Map of Proposed Zoning Map Amendments indicating the locations).

	General Location/Area	Current Zone	Proposed Zone	Comments
1	950 El Camino Real	CPC	CVS	LUE changed to Retail Commercial. Recommendation is to change to Coastal Visitor Serving zone because the site is located in the Coastal Zone.
7	1230 to 1293 South 4 <sup>th</sup> St.	RA	UR	Recommendation is to change zoning to Urban Reserve which requires a Specific Plan prior to residential development.
9	150 South Highway 1 (Train Station)	PF	CVS	LUE changed to Public Facilities. Recommendation is to change to Coastal Visitor Serving zone because the site is located in the Coastal Zone.
12	South side of Ramona Ave. between 4 <sup>th</sup> & 5 <sup>th</sup> Streets	R3	R3 or VS	LUE update changed area to Visitor Serving (VS) zone. Recommendation is to retain R3 zoning and amend LUE to corresponding High Density Residential. Alternative is to rezone VS.
12	South side of Ramona Ave. between 5 <sup>th</sup> & 8 <sup>th</sup> Streets	R-3	R3 or CBO	LUE update changed area to Central Business (CB) zone. Recommendation is to retain R3 zoning and amend LUE to corresponding High Density Residential. Alternative is to rezone CBO.
18	Area bounded by 12 <sup>th</sup> & 14 <sup>th</sup> Sts. & Longbranch & Manhattan Aves	CP & R3	R3	LUE update changed these two blocks to Neighborhood Commercial & Low Density Residential. Council subsequently requested the Commission reevaluate the zoning. Recommendation is to change both blocks to R3. Alternatives include Neighborhood Commercial, R2 or R3 or a combination.

Zoning Map amendment #1 (see discussion of General Plan Map Amendment #1).

Zoning Map amendment #7 (see discussion of General Plan Map Amendment #9).

Zoning Map amendment #9 (see discussion of General Plan Map Amendment #3).

Zoning Map amendment #12 (see discussion of General Plan Map Amendment #5).

Zoning Map amendment #18 (see discussion of General Plan Map Amendment #8).

The Zoning Code update does not specifically authorize a development project for the affected properties. However, in the future, if these properties are proposed to be developed with more intense uses than contemplated by this review, an evaluation of the impacts resulting from a change in land uses would be conducted.

### **Impacts That Would Not Have Any Impacts**

The following amendments would not authorize or facilitate new development. The proposed revisions are changes to text, the development review process, and design policies that would not have an effect on the environment. Therefore, these amendments are not analyzed in the Initial Study.

#### Local Coastal Program Amendments

The Local Coastal Program would be amended to reflect the new Land Use Map names (e.g., Visitor Serving Mixed-Use) and the new zone names as follows:

- Chapter 1.3 (Relationship to the General Plan & Zoning Ordinance) would be revised to reflect LUE and the Zoning Code updates.
- Chapter 7 (Description of Land Use and Zoning Designations) would be revised to reflect LUE and the Zoning Code updates.
- Map 5 (Land Use Designations) and Map 6 (Zoning Districts) would be revised to reflect LUE and the Zoning Code updates.
- All references to a specific zone would be revised throughout the document to reflect the Zoning Code updates.

#### Zoning Code Amendments

The following Zoning Code amendments are proposed.

- Updates Use table to allow uses that previously required discretionary permits and/or require discretionary permits for projects that were previously allowed.
- Revised development standards for specific uses (e.g., parking, loading, limitations on use).
- Added new design policies to mitigate potential impacts from specific uses (e.g., recycling centers, large family day care centers).
- Rename zones (e.g., Light Manufacturing is renamed Industrial).
- Update the procedures and administrative regulations. For example, revised non-conforming regulations for uses, structures and parking.
- Reformat and consolidate the Zoning Code for ease of use.

## **SECTION 3**

### **IMPACT ANALYSIS**

---

The City reviewed the previously adopted Negative Declaration in conjunction with the current proposed revisions and determined that the proposed revisions described in this Addendum would not result in any new or significantly adverse environmental impacts or an increase in severity of previously identified less than significant impacts. The following is an analysis of the proposed revisions.

#### **3.1 AESTHETICS**

The proposed amendments would reduce the size of telecommunication facilities allowed in the area west of Highway 1, thereby reducing potential aesthetic impacts resulting from the construction of telecommunication facilities. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. All new development shall comply with existing General Plan and Local Coastal Program policies and Development Code requirements regarding aesthetics. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to aesthetics and visual resources as a result of the Amendment.

#### **3.2 AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

The proposed amendments would remove language from the LCP regarding agricultural uses that were previously removed from the Coastal Zone as part of a boundary adjustment approved in 2000. The proposed amendments would not authorize or facilitate new development. The proposed Amendment does not contain any policies that would affect agricultural use. All new development shall comply with existing General Plan and Local Coastal Program policies and Development Code requirements regarding agricultural uses. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to agricultural resources as a result of the Amendment.

#### **3.3 AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

The proposed amendments would add policies such as adopting a trail plan that would have beneficial impacts on air quality and the reduction of greenhouse gases. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. The proposed Amendment does not contain any policies that would affect air quality or increase greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to air quality and greenhouse gas emissions as a result of the Amendment.

#### **3.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

The proposed Amendment would add policies that would have beneficial impacts on the protection of biological resources such as the preservation and protection of creek corridors. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to biological resources as a result of the Amendment.

#### **3.5 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

The proposed Amendment does not contain policies regarding cultural resources. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to cultural resources as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.6 GEOLOGY & SOILS**

The proposed Amendment does not contain policies regarding geology and soils. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to geology and soils as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.7 HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

The proposed Amendment does not contain policies regarding or having an effect on hazards. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to hazards as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.8 HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**

The proposed Amendment would add policies that would have beneficial impacts on the water quality such as watershed protection, water conservation, and stormwater management. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to water resources as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.9 LAND USE & PLANNING**

The proposed Amendment would revise a policy reducing the potential expansion of non-conforming uses west of Highway 1, thereby reducing potential development. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to land use and planning as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.10 MINERAL RESOURCES**

The proposed Amendment does not contain policies regarding or having an effect on mineral resources. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to mineral resources as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.11 NOISE**

The proposed Amendment does not contain policies regarding or having an effect on noise. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to noise as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.12 POPULATION & HOUSING**

The proposed Amendment does not contain policies regarding or having an effect on population and housing. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to population and housing as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.13 PUBLIC SERVICES**

The proposed Amendment does not contain policies regarding or having an effect on public services. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development.

Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to public services as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.14 RECREATION**

The proposed Amendment does not contain policies regarding or having an effect on recreation. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to recreation as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.15 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC**

The proposed Amendment does not contain policies regarding or having an effect on transportation/traffic. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to transportation/traffic as a result of the Amendment.

### **3.16 UTILITY & SERVICE SYSTEMS**

The proposed Amendment does not contain policies regarding or having an effect on utility and service systems. The proposed Amendment does not authorize or facilitate new development. Therefore, no new impacts or increase in the severity of impacts would occur in regards to utility and service systems as a result of the Amendment.

## **SECTION 4**

### **CONCLUSION**

---

The Amendment is focused on adding or revising existing and new policies involving the protection of natural resources. The only change to a development standard would decrease the allowed size of telecommunication facilities west of Highway 1. Based on the discussion of potential impacts as a result of the Amendment, the Amendment would not result in new impacts or increase the severity of impacts previously identified as less than significant. Thus, the revised Amendment would not: a) result in increased impacts related to degradation of the environment; b) result in increased cumulative impacts; or c) result in increased substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. No significant, adverse, and unavoidable impacts to the environment as a result of this Amendment have been identified.

Approval of the project is not expected to have any significant, adverse, and unavoidable impacts, either long-term or short-term, nor will it cause substantial adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly. In summary, the analysis concludes that none of the conditions described in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or Negative Declaration have occurred, and thus an Addendum to the previously adopted Negative Declaration is appropriate to satisfy CEQA requirements for the proposed Amendment. The evidence in the file supports the finding that no circumstances or conditions requiring the preparation of a subsequent Negative Declaration or EIR are present in this case.