City of Fullerton Initial Study Checklist Form



1. Project title: *PRJ13-00313 – LRP13-00038 – TPM 2013-168*

Dongshin Presbyterian Church

2. Lead agency name

and address:

City of Fullerton

303 W. Commonwealth Ave.

Fullerton, CA 92832

3. Lead Agency

contact person and phone number:

Joan Wolff (714) 738-6837

4. Project location:

2505 Yorba Linda Blvd, 2442, 2450, 2456 and 2460 Almira Ave.

Fullerton, CA

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Dongshin Presbyterian Church

2505 Yorba Linda Blvd. Fullerton, CA 92831

6. General plan

designation:

"Religious Use"

7. Zoning: R1-10 (Single Family Residential, minimum lot size 10,000 sf)

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The project consists of two separate actions:

- 1) A Tentative Parcel Map to subdivide one parcel, addressed 2505 Yorba Linda Blvd, 2442 Almira Ave. and 2460 Almira Ave. into three separate parcels. The overall site is 341,075 square feet in size (7.83 acres) and is comprised of a church with associated educational and multi-purpose facilities and two residential structures, originally designed and used as single family homes but subsequently acquired by the church for office and related functions. After acquisition, what had originally been three separate properties were consolidated into a single parcel. With the Tentative Parcel map, the property lines would be restored to their original configurations.
- 2) A General Plan Revision to restore the Low Density Residential designation to four residential properties acquired by the church for office and related church uses. Properties at 2442, 2450, 2456 and 2460 Almira Ave. were acquired by the church at separate times, and the General Plan designation of all four properties was changed from "Low Density Residential" to "Religious Use" in separate actions over time.

With the current parcel map application, the largest property addressed 2505 Yorba Linda Blvd., would continue to be used as a church. It would retain its current R1-10 zoning and "Religious Use" General Plan Designation and after subdivision, would be situated on a lot 318,842 square feet (7.32 acres) in size. After subdivision, properties at 2442 and 2460 Almira Ave. would have lot sizes of 10,815 and 11,418 respectively, consistent with applicable zoning requirements of the R1-10 District.

Prior interior improvements made to properties at 2442, 2450, 2456 and 2460 Almira Ave. (for office and other church related uses) would be reversed and the homes restored for use as single family residences under appropriate building codes. A corresponding change of General Plan designation/Community Development Types from "Religious Use" to "Low Density Residential", in concert with the parcel map, would permit properties at 2442, 2450, 2456 and 2460 Almira Ave. to be sold or leased as single family homes, independent of the adjacent church.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

NORTH: Single family homes in the R1-10 District, with a General Plan designation of "Low Density Residential".

SOUTH: Vacant lot owned by Cal State University Fullerton zoned PL (Public Land) and with a General Plan designation of "School".

EAST: City of Fullerton Fire station zoned PL (Public Land) and Marshall B Ketchum University zoned OP (Office Professional).

WEST: Residential properties zoned R1-10 and PRD (Planned Residential Development), respectively used as a fraternity house and residential condominiums.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

None

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 Biological Resources Greenhouse Gas Emissions Land Use/Planning Population/Housing Transportation/Traffic	Agriculture & Forest Resources Cultural Resources Hazards & Hazardous Materials Mineral Resources Public Services Utilities/Service Systems	Air Quality Geology/Soils Hydrology/Water Quality Noise Recreation Mandatory Findings of Significance
	DETERMINA	TION: (To be completed by the	City of Fullerton)
	On the basis of this initial evalua	ation:	
	✓ I find that the proposed NEGATIVE DECLARATI		ant effect on the environment, and a
	will not be a significant e		cant effect on the environment, there in the project have been made by or EDECLARATION will be prepared.
		d project MAY have a significant ACT REPORT is required.	effect on the environment, and an
	Significant Unless Mitig adequately analyzed in been addressed by mitig	ated' Impact on the environment, ban earlier document pursuant to apgation measures based on the earlie ENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required	y Significant Impact' or 'Potentially out at least one effect 1) has been plicable legal standards, and 2) has er analysis as described on attached I, but it must analyze only the effects
	because all potentially s NEGATIVE DECLARAT mitigated pursuant to t	ignificant effects (a) have been anal ION pursuant to applicable standa	gnificant effect on the environment, yzed adequately in an earlier EIR or rds, and (b) have been avoided or CLARATION, including revisions or ject, nothing further is required.
_	Joan Wolff Signature		
	Joan Wolff	For City of Fuller	ton

CHECKLIST OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. A	AESTHETICS –Would the project:	•			
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				✓
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				√
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				✓
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				✓
	(References: The Fullerton Plan – 2012; Part 2	: Exhibit 10 Sc	enic Corridors)		
		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
In de Eval and infor Asse	AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES – Woul etermining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental function and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conser farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberlan remation compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regard systement Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and the forest carbon meas fornia Air Resources Board.	effects, lead ago vation as an opti nd, are significan ling the state's in	encies may refer to onal model to use in nt environmental ef ventory of forest lan	n assessing impact. fects, lead agencie d, including the Fo	s on agriculture es may refer to orest and Range
a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				✓
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				✓
c)	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)) or timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code section 4526)				✓

forest land to non-forest use?

(References: Orange County Important Farmland 2010 ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2010/ora10.pdf;
The Fullerton Plan – 2012; Part 2: Exhibit 2 Community Development Plan & Exhibit 19 Public Parks and Recreational Facilities)

non-forest use?

d) Result in loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact					
III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:									
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality manage following determinations.	ement or air pol	lution control distric	rt may be relied up	oon to make the					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				√					
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				✓					
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				✓					
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				✓					
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				√					
(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012; Part 2: Chapter	r 17, Air Quali	ty and Climate Ch	ange)						

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly of through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local of regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	s r e			✓
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habita or other sensitive natural community identified in local o regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	r a			✓

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact			
c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				√			
d)	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?				√			
e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				√			
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				√			
	(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012; Part 2: Chapter 19 Open Space and Natural Resources)							

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?				✓
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?				✓
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✓
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				✓
	(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012: Part 2: Chapter 3, Hist	oric Preservai	tion, Table 6 and E	Exhibits 4 - 5)	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:				
a)	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.				√
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				✓
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				✓
	iv) Landslides				✓
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				✓
c)	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?				√
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				✓
e)	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?				√
	(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012; Po	art 2: Exhibits	26 and 27)		

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	
VI	I. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS –					
Wo	ould the project:					
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or				✓	
	indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the					
	environment?					
b)	Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation of				✓	
	an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the					
	emissions of greenhouse gases?					
	(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012; Appendix H-Climate Action Plan)					

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	II. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – ould the project:				
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				✓
b)	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?				✓
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓
d)	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?				✓
e)	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 for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				√		
h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				✓		
	(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012, Part 2: Chapter 20 Natural Hazards, Exhibits14, 16, 18-20 & 26-30, Table 10)						

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the oject:				
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				✓
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				✓
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				✓
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				✓
e)	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?				✓
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				✓
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood				✓

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
	Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?						
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✓		
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				√		
j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓		
	(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012, Part 2: Chapter 16 Water and Exhibits 29-30)						

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X.]	LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a)	Physically divide an established community?				✓
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				✓
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓
	(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012, Part 1: The Fuller	ton Vision, Pa	rt 2: Exhibit 2, Tai	bles 4-5)	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				✓
b) 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?				√

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI	I. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				✓
b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				✓
c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✓
d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✓
e)	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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓
f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓
	(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012, Part 2: Chapter 7	Noise, Tables	9-10 and Exhibits	13 & 14)	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	II. POPULATION AND HOUSING – ould the project:				
a)	Induce substantial 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)?				✓
b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
	(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012, Part 2: Cha	pter 2; Housin	g Element 3/2/201	10)	

	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant With	Less Than Significant	No Impact
	Impact	Mitigation Incorporation	Impact	
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical is physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or construction of which could cause significant environmental ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of	physically impacts, in	ociated with the altered gove order to main	rnmental fac	cilities, the
Fire protection?				✓
Police protection?				✓
Schools?				✓
Parks?				✓
Other public facilities?				✓
(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012, Part 2: Chapter 10 Public Safety, Exhi Chapter 14 Education, Ex		r 12 Parks and Re	creation, Exhibi	ts 19, 20, 25;
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION				
a) 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?				✓
b) 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?				✓
(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012; Part 2: Chapter 12	Parks and Rec	reation, Exhibits	19-21, 25)	
	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:				

mass transit?

a) Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.) taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				✓
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				√
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				√
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				✓
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				✓
(Reference: The Fullerton Plan – 2012; Part 2: Chapter 4 Mobility, Chapte	r 5 Bicycle, Ext	hibits 6-12; Append	dix G Bicycle M	aster Plan)

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV	II. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the	project:			
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				✓
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				✓
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				✓
e)	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				✓

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				✓
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				✓
	(The Fullerton Plan – 2012; Part 2: Chapter 16 Water, Ch	apter 18 Integ	rated Waste Mana	gement)	

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV	II. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				✓
b)	Does the project have 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)?				✓
c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				✓

Discussion of Environmental Checklist Questions:

"No Impact" has been checked for each of the environmental checklist categories because the effects of this project would result only in "paper" changes. The proposed subdivision would reestablish property lines that were previously in place, and the proposed General Plan Revision would restore the prior designations to the residential parcels. As such, the proposal would affect the City's General Plan map and the legal division of property, with no physical changes taking place. No new structures are proposed and near term construction resulting from application approval would be limited to interior remodeling of existing buildings. Current zoning will remain in place, and the uses are consistent with that zoning.

<u>Aesthetics</u>: No new construction is proposed; therefore the visual environment would remain unchanged. There would be no effect on views, scenic resources or visual character of the surrounding area and no new lighting added.

<u>Agriculture & Forest Resources</u>: The City of Fullerton is an urban/suburban community, in which there is no farmland or forest land.

<u>Air Quality</u>: The project maintains the status quo with respect to existing development. The only change is the conversion of four buildings, originally constructed as single family homes, back to that original use. No new construction or uses are proposed which could generate increased emissions or adversely affect air quality.

<u>Biological Resources</u>: The project site is developed land, on which a church, residential buildings and associated parking and landscape areas exist. The land does not currently serve as a wildlife habitat and existing vegetation is typical for existing land uses. The site does is not a wetland or riparian habitat, and is not subject to a conservation plan. No vegetation is proposed to be added or removed from the properties.

<u>Cultural Resources</u>: Existing buildings on the site were constructed in the 1960's and are not identified on the Cit of Fullerton Historic Resource Survey. Due to the developed nature of the site and the fact that no excavation is proposed, no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated.

<u>Geology/Soils</u>: The project involves no new construction or grading, and existing structures have been present on the site for approximately 50 years. Therefore, no new structures will be exposed to geologic events, and the structures are all connected to existing waste water disposal systems.

<u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u>: With no new construction or change in use, no new greenhouse gas emissions are projected.

<u>Hazards & Hazardous Materials</u>: Existing church and residential uses do not typically utilize, store or transport hazardous materials, other than household cleaning and gardening products. The properties are not on a list of hazardous material sites.

<u>Hydrology/Water Quality</u>: Due to the small scale and nature of existing development and the fact that no new development is proposed, violations of water quality standards, depletion of ground water or alteration of drainage patterns are highly unlikely. Although the property is located near Fullerton Creek, it is not in a flood hazard zone (per Figure 4.15 of the Fullerton

Local Hazard Mitigation Plan). The inland location is 20+ miles from the coast and is therefore not subject to tsunami.

<u>Land Use/Planning</u>: All buildings are existing and the project proposes to restore residential structures to their original use, consistent with the R1-10 zoning classification.

<u>Mineral Resources</u>: There are no mineral resources sites in the City of Fullerton, and the project site is fully developed with existing church uses.

<u>Noise</u>: There is no change to the church property and only minimal change in use from church auxiliary buildings to single family residences. The property is located in a residential area, and the existing church and proposed conversion of structures back to single family residences will be compatible with the surrounding uses.

<u>Population/Housing</u>: The conversion of structures back to the single family residences they once were will have a negligible impact on population and housing.

<u>Public Services</u>: Public services are currently in place for the buildings as they now exist, the minor change in use of the Almira properties will have minimal, if any, impact on public services.

<u>Recreation</u>: Parks and recreational facilities are currently in place for users of the buildings that currently exist; the minor change in use will have minimal, if any, impact upon recreational facilities.

<u>Transportation/Traffic</u>: The proposed changes are so minor in nature that any change in traffic or transportation systems would be negligible.

<u>Utilities/Service Systems</u>: The conversion of structures back to the single family residences they once were will have a negligible impact on utility and service system. There will be no change in use of the church property and no new development.

<u>Mandatory Findings of Significance</u>: The project includes no new development and negligible change in use of existing development. The property does not provide wildlife habitat, and existing vegetation is typical of that found in residential areas. The change in General Plan designation does not expand potential uses, but rather returns a portion of the property to residential use after a time in which existing structures were used for auxiliary church activities. No change in zoning is proposed, and intended uses are consistent with existing zoning classification.