



**CITY OF LOMPOC
INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY
NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Pursuant to State of California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 to 21174, as amended and in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, no potentially significant impacts were identified to result from the project and a Negative Declaration is hereby made on the following project:

The Planning Division of the City of Lompoc has determined that:

There are no significant adverse environmental impacts created by this project.

There are no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with this project if the following conditions/mitigation measures are met.

PROJECT TITLE:

Zoning Text Amendment (TA 18-03) to definitions and standards relating to animal raising and keeping.

GENERAL AREA DESCRIPTION / ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The Zoning Text Amendment would apply Citywide within the respective Lompoc City limits (approximately 11 square miles) within urbanized areas on any lot (in any zoning district) containing a single family residence. These urbanized sites do not have rare, endangered, or threatened plants, animals, or habitats as shown on the *Biologically Significant Areas* map as identified in the 2030 Lompoc General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element (Figure C/OS-1).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would allow chickens, birds, ducks and rabbits (excluding turkeys and peacocks) to be kept on any lot containing a single family residence, including a legal nonconforming single family residence, in any zone, provided the animal raising and keeping complies with all regulations listed in Section 17.020.020(I) as described in the environmental

checklist of the proposed Zoning Text Amendment.

PROJECT REVIEW:

The environmental impacts associated with the Zoning Text Amendment were determined using the City of Lompoc Environmental Checklist (attached) and the adopted Environmental Review Guidelines. Based on the above mentioned sources, no adverse impacts are associated with any of the environmental factors listed in the attached checklist.

ENVIRONMENTAL RECOMMENDATION:

Based upon the information available at the time of the preparation of this report and, without benefit of the additional information which may come to light at a public hearing, it is recommended that a Negative Declaration be filed for a Zoning Text Amendment to definitions and standards relating to animal raising and keeping based upon information contained in TA 18-03.

PREPARED BY:



Stacy L. Lawson, Senior Environmental Coordinator 12-18-18
Date



Brian Halvorson, Planning Manager 12-18-18
Date

**CITY OF LOMPOC
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

A. PROJECT INFORMATION:

| | |
|--|--|
| Project Title: Text Amendment to definitions and standards relating to animal raising and keeping | Project No: TA 18-03 |
| Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Lompoc 100 Civic Center Plaza, Lompoc, CA 93436 P.O. Box 8001, Lompoc, CA 93438-8001 | Contact Person and Phone Number: Brian Halvorson Planning Manager (805) 875-8228 b_halvorson@ci.lompoc.ca.us |

PROJECT DESCRIPTION / LOCATION:

The proposed zoning text amendment would allow chickens, birds, ducks and rabbits (excluding turkeys and peacocks) to be kept on any lot containing a single family residence. If adopted, the Ordinance would be effective Citywide.

The proposed zoning text amendment to the Lompoc Municipal Code includes the following revisions:

- 1) Add a definition to the Lompoc Municipal Code (LMC) section 17.008.020 (Definitions and Standards) as follows:

Animal Raising and Keeping shall mean the non-commercial tending of small animals that are not household pets (such as chickens, birds, ducks, and rabbits, but not including turkeys or peacocks).
- 2) Amend the definition in LMC section 17.008.020 (Definitions and Standards) to read:

Household Pets shall mean domestic animals, including up to two (2) Asian miniature pot-bellied pigs, and birds ordinarily permitted inside a dwelling and kept only for the company or pleasure provided to the occupants.
- 3) Add section 17.088.200 to the Lompoc Municipal Code as follows:

 A. Animal raising and keeping shall be a permitted use on any lot containing a single family residence, including a legal non-conforming single family residence, in any zone, provided the animal raising and keeping complies with all regulations listed in Section 17.020.020(I).
- 4) Amend Section 17.020.020 by adding a subdivision I, thereto, to read as follows:

 I. Animal Raising and Keeping, when not done for sale to others and only done for the personal use of the resident(s) of the single-family dwelling in a clean and sanitary enclosure that meets the following requirements:
 1. At least forty feet from any door or window of each adjoining residence;
 2. At least ten feet from the rear property line, unless an alley abuts the rear of the property, then no rear setback is required;
 3. At least ten feet from each side property line (excludes front yard);
 4. On the rear half of the parcel;
 5. The cumulative number of small animals on any property shall be a maximum of six (6);
 6. Roosters are prohibited;

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>7. Does not create an offensive noise or odor for adjacent property owners; 8. Is located on a lot equal to or greater than five thousand (5,000) square feet in area; and 9. Birds, not including chickens or ducks are permitted to be kept in an enclosed aviary, which shall be no closer than 30-feet away from any residence other than that of the owner of the aviary. The number of birds in an aviary shall not exceed six (6) for each full 6,000 square feet of premises of the owner.</p> | |
| <p>Public Agencies with Approval Authority (Including permits, funding, or participation agreements): City of Lompoc</p> | |
| <p>Project Applicant, Name and Address: N/A</p> | <p>Project Consultant: N/A</p> |
| <p>General Plan Designations: Any designation on a lot containing a single family residence including a legal nonconforming single residence</p> | <p>City Zoning Designations: Any zone on a lot containing a single family residence including a legal nonconforming single family residence</p> |
| <p>Surrounding Land Use Designations: Various</p> | |
| <p>Surrounding Land Uses/Zoning: Various</p> | |
| <p>Environmental Setting: Existing urbanized area where there is an existing single family residence.</p> | |
| <p>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:</p> <p>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.</p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Noise <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance </p> | |

B. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Identify the potential for significant adverse impacts below. Note mitigation measures, if available, for significant adverse impacts.

| I. AESTHETICS Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | | X |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | | | | X |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | | | X | |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | | | X |

Comments:

a) The proposed Text Amendment applies to an existing urbanized area and will not create new structures. Therefore, the allowance of chickens/birds/ducks/rabbits on lots with a single-family residential use will have no impact on scenic vistas in Lompoc.

b) The proposed Text Amendment will not result in substantial damage to scenic resources as scenic resources are generally not found on urban properties and the keeping of small animals on residentially used property must comply with section 17.020.020 (I), as proposed.

c) The visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings will not be substantially degraded, as all residential properties keeping small animals will need to comply with proposed section 17.020.020 (I) relating to location, setbacks and number of animals allowed on a lot.

d) The proposed Text Amendment will not result in substantial light or glare, or adversely impact nighttime views, as compliance with the requirements of proposed section 17.020.020 (I) will govern enclosures built and setbacks required for the keeping of small animals.

| II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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? | | | | X |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | | X |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production? | | | | |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | |

| II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? | | | | X |

Comments:

a, b, c, d, e) The proposed Text Amendment applies to an existing urbanized area. The provision allowing the raising and keeping of small animals on properties with a single-family residence will not have an impact on Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide importance, will not conflict with existing Williamson Act contracts or involve other changes in the existing environment which due to their location or nature could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Residential use lands within the City of Lompoc are all within the urbanized core of the City and therefore no impact on farmland or conversion of farmland will result from allowing the raising and keeping of small animals on properties with a single-family residential use.

| III. AIR QUALITY Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | | | X |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | | X |
| 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)? | | | | X |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | | X |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | X | |

Comments:

a-e) The proposed Text Amendment to allow the keeping and raising of small animals on lots containing a single family residence will not obstruct the implementation of any applicable air quality plan; violate any air quality standard; will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the City is in non-attainment; will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, because of the limited impact of keeping of up to six small animals and the limitation that the keeping of such animals does not result in offensive odors as contained in the amendment to section 17.020.020 (I).

| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | | X |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-f) The proposed Text Amendment will not have a substantial adverse effect directly, or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a sensitive species in local or regional plans, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, nor will it affect federally protected wetlands, nor will it affect migratory wildlife corridors, nor will it affect biological resources, nor will it conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, nor will it conflict with an approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, as the proposed Text Amendment will only allow the keeping of up to six small animals, appropriately housed and maintained as contained in the amendment to section 17.020.020 (I).

| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? | | | | X |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? | | | | X |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | | X |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-d) The proposed Text Amendment will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archaeological resource, as identified in the City of Lompoc Cultural Resources Study and “Archeological Sensitivity Zones” Map on file with the City of Lompoc Planning Division; as the raising and keeping of small animals on property containing a single family residence will not involve the construction or excavating for structures or infrastructure and therefore will not impact archaeological, paleontological artifacts or human remains.

| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| 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. | | | | X |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | | X |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | | X |
| iv) Landslides? | | | | X |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |

| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| 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? | | | | X |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-e) The proposed Text Amendment will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from an earthquake fault, ground shaking or failure, erosion, expansive soils or septic tanks because the proposed Text Amendment only permits the raising and keeping of up to six small animals on a lot containing an existing single-family residence.

| VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | | | | X |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | | | X |

Comments:

a, b) The proposed Text Amendment will not generate greenhouse gas emissions that will have a significant impact or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions as the allowance for keeping and raising of six small animals will not have an impact on greenhouse gases.

| VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |

| VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-h) The proposed Text Amendment allowing the raising and keeping of small animals on residential property will not result in the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment, impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, or 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, as the presence of six small animals will not create or invite hazards or hazardous materials.

| VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | | | X |

| VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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)? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| 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. | | | | X |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | | | | X |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | | X |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | X |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-j) The proposed Text Amendment will not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, deplete groundwater supplies, interfere with groundwater recharge, substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area, create or contribute run-off water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off. The proposed Text Amendment will not place a greater demand on water supply or quality than an existing single family residential land use or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, or flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. The proposed Text Amendment will not create a threat of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. Therefore, the ability to raise and keep up to six (6) small animals on a property containing an existing single family residence will not no impacts to water quality or quantity.

| IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Physically divide an established community? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-c) The proposed Text Amendment will not physically divide an established community or conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations that avoid or mitigate an environmental effect. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans applicable in the City of Lompoc. The raising and keeping of up to six small animals on a lot containing a single family residence will not conflict with applicable plans and policies and therefore no impacts will occur to land use and planning.

| X. MINERAL RESOURCES | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-b) The proposed Text Amendment will not result in a loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state as the allowance for the raising and keeping of small animals will occur on residential property and will therefore not impact mineral resources.

| XI. NOISE | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project: | | | | |
| 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? | | | X | |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels? | | | X | |

| XI. NOISE Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | X | |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | X | |
| 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? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-f) The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would allow the non-commercial raising and keeping of up to six (6) small animals on a lot containing a single family residence which would not expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of, standards established in the local general plan, ground borne noise levels or result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels, as the keeping of small animals is subject to compliance with the City's odor and noise regulations and the provisions contained in Sections 17.008.020 and 17.020.020I outlining required setbacks, lot location (rear half), the prohibition of roosters, turkeys and peacocks) and a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet.

| XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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 and other infrastructure)? | | | | X |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | X |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-c) The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would not induce population growth, or displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people, due to its limited nature in allowing the non-commercial keeping of up to six (6) small animals on a lot containing a single family residence.

| XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES Would the project result in: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) 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: | | | | X |
| b) Fire Protection? | | | | X |
| c) Police protection? | | | | X |
| d) Schools? | | | | X |
| e) Parks? | | | | X |
| f) Other public facilities? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-f) The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or 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 Fire, Police, Schools, Parks, or other public services, as the keeping of up to six small animals would not result in impacts to service ratios, response times or require increased levels of service from other governmental agencies as the Zoning Text Amendment allowing the non-commercial tending of small animals would not expand or intensify an existing single family residential use on a lot in any zoning district.

| XIV. RECREATION Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |

Comments:

a) The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would not increase an existing single family use within existing residential neighborhoods and regional parks, other recreational facilities, or cause substantial physical deterioration of existing neighborhoods, due to the fact the non-commercial keeping of animals is required to comply with standards specified in proposed Section 17.020.020(l).

b) The Zoning Text Amendment does not include recreational facilities or require construction or expansion of regional parks or other recreational facilities, as no new development is proposed as a part of the amendment.

| XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks? | | | | X |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? | | | | X |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | | X |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | | | | X |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-g) The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would not cause a substantial increase in traffic (when compared to a single family use) or exceed a level of service standard, change air traffic patterns or increase hazards due to a design feature, result in inadequate emergency access or parking (only the non-commercial tending of small animals would be allowed), or conflict with alternative transportation policies, as the project would only allow for up to six small animals to be kept on a lot containing a single-family residential residence.

| XVI. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| Would the project 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 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: | | | | X |
| a) 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 | | | | X |
| b) 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 |

Comments

a-b) The proposed Zoning Text Amendment does not involve a cultural resource which would be listed or eligible for listing or be significant to a Native American tribe, as the project is only the cumulative allowance for up to six (6) small animals to be kept on a lot containing a single-family residence.

| XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Coast Region of the Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| 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? | | | | X |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | | | | X |
| 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 in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | | X |

| XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | | X |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | | X |

Comments:

a-e) The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would not have an impact on water systems or availability, wastewater treatment capacity, or storm water facilities, as the project does not propose new development and allows the keeping of animals on single-family properties.

f-g) The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would not have an impact on the landfill or solid waste regulatory compliance, as no new development is proposed and the quantity of small animals proposed to be permitted on a property with a lot containing a single-family use would not impact landfill tonnages.

| XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the project: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| a) 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? | | | | X |
| b) 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 |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | | X | |

Comments:

a-c) The proposed Zoning Text Amendment would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, or eliminate the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal; or create impacts that are cumulatively considerable; or cause substantial adverse effects on human beings directly or indirectly, as no new development is proposed and only the cumulative allowance for up to six (6) animals to be kept on a lot containing a single-family residence use is proposed.

| | |
|---|--|
| DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation: | |
| X | 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 to 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. |



Stacy L. Lawson
 Senior Environmental Coordinator

12-18-18

Date



Brian Halvorson
 Planning Manager

12-18-18

Date