



CITY OF LONG BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

333 West Ocean Blvd., 5th Floor Long Beach, CA 90802 (562) 570-6194 FAX (562) 570-6068

PLANNING BUREAU

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION

TO: Office of the County Clerk
 Environmental Filings
 12400 E. Imperial Highway, Room 2001
 Norwalk, CA 90650

FROM: Department of Development Services
 Planning Bureau, 5th Floor
 333 W. Ocean Boulevard
 Long Beach, CA 90802

Office of Planning and Research
 1400 Tenth St., Room 121
 Sacramento, CA 95814

Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

Project Title: Single-Lot Rezoning from CNR to R-2-I at 2 61st Place ND-03-16

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to Clearinghouse): 2016091056

Lead Agency: City of Long Beach
Lead Agency Contact Person: Scott Kinsey **Area Code/Telephone:** (562) 570-6194

Project Applicant: Lance Vander Zanden

Project Location (include county): 2 61st Place, City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County

Project Description:

Zone Change from CNR to R-2-I, which would apply to the subject site only, for the purposes of demolishing the existing single-family dwelling and garage, and constructing a new three-story single-family dwelling and garage conforming to the R-2-I development standards. For the purposes of this Initial Study, this project is analyzed as consisting of both the Zone Change, and the demolition of existing improvements and construction of the new single-family dwelling and garage. Throughout this Initial Study, reference to "the project" means the entire scope of the project, including both the Zone Change, and the demolition and construction activities, as described in this section.

The applicant requests this Zone Change from CNR to R-2-I so that the subject residential property would match the zoning of the vast majority of residential properties on The Peninsula, and therefore would enjoy the same residential development rights as the other R-2-I-zoned properties.

2016 296568



FILED
Dec 07 2016

Dean C. Logan, Registrar - Recorder/County Clerk

Electronically signed by ISAURA CORREA

THIS NOTICE WAS POSTED

ON December 07 2016

UNTIL January 06 2017

REGISTRAR - RECORDER/COUNTY CLERK

This is to advise that the Long Beach City Council carried out the above-described project on **December 6, 2016**, and has made the following determinations regarding the above-described project:

1. The project (will/ will not) have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
 A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA (adopted by the Long Beach City Council: December 6, 2016).
3. Mitigation Measures (were/ were not) made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (was/ was not) adopted for this project.
5. A Statement of Overriding Considerations (was/ was not) adopted for this project.
6. Findings (were/ were not) made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the Negative Declaration record of approval is available for review to the general public at:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau
333 W. Ocean Blvd., 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802



Planning Bureau Clerk

12/7/16

Date

2016 296568

FILED
Dec 07 2016

Dean C. Logan, Registrar - Recorder/County Clerk

Electronically signed by ISaura CORREA



State of California – Natural Resources Agency
 DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
 South Coast Region
 3883 Ruffin Road
 San Diego, CA 92123
www.wildlife.ca.gov

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Governor
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



CEQA Filing Fee No Effect Determination

Applicant Name and Address: Lance Vander Zanden, 1500 E. Ocean Blvd., Unit 303
 Long Beach, CA 90802

CEQA Lead Agency: City of Long Beach

Project Name: Single-lot Rezoning from CNR to R-2-I at 2 61st Place ND-03-16

CEQA Document Type: Negative Declaration (ND-03-16)

State Clearing House Number and/or local agency ID number: N/A

Project Location: 2 61st Place, Long Beach.

Project Description: Zone Change and Local Coastal Development Permit on a 3,184-sq. ft. lot located at 2 61st Place, in conjunction with the demolition of an existing two-story single-family dwelling, and construction of a new three-story single-family dwelling. The proposed project consists of a Zone Change and Local Coastal Development Permit on a 3,184-sq. ft. lot located at 2 61st Place, currently developed with a single-family dwelling and garage. The zoning designation will be changed from CNR (Neighborhood Commercial and Residential District), a mixed-use zoning district that allows one single-family dwelling and retail commercial space to be built on this particular site at a total of two stories tall, to R-2-I, a two-family residential-only district that allows three-story development. The project also will involve demolition of the existing 2-story single-family dwelling and construction of a new 3-story single-family dwelling. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15072(g)(5), the project site is not listed as a hazardous property as designated under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

Determination: Based on a review of the project as proposed, the Department of Fish and Wildlife has determined that for purposes of the assessment of CEQA filing fees (Fish and Game Code [FGC] Section 711.4(c)) the project has no effect on fish, wildlife or their habitat and the project as described does not require payment of a CEQA filing fee. This determination does not in any way imply that the project is exempt from CEQA and does not determine the significance of any potential project effects evaluated pursuant to CEQA.

Please retain this original determination for your records. Local lead agencies are required to file two copies of this determination with the county clerk at time of filing of the Notice of Determination (NOD) after the project is approved. State lead agencies are required to file two copies of this determination with the Office of Planning and Research (State Clearinghouse) at the time of filing the NOD. If you do not file a copy of this determination as appropriate with the county clerk or State Clearinghouse at the time of filing of the NOD, the appropriate CEQA filing fee will be due and payable.

Without a valid CEQA Filing Fee No Effect Determination form or proof of fee payment, the project will not be operative, vested, or final and any local permits issued for the project will be invalid, pursuant to FGC Section 711.4(c)(3).

DFW Approved By: Scott P. Harris _____ Scott P. Harris Date: 09/22/2016

Title: Environmental Scientist

2016 296568
 FILED
 Dec 07 2016

Dean C. Logan, Registrar - Recorder/County Clerk
 Electronically signed by ISAUORA CORREA

State of California—Natural Resources Agency
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
2016 ENVIRONMENTAL FILING FEE CASH RECEIPT

RECEIPT # 201612071230043
STATE CLEARING HOUSE # (If applicable)

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY

LEAD AGENCY CITY OF LONG BEACH			DATE 12/07/2016
COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING LA			DOCUMENT NUMBER 2016296568
PROJECT TITLE SINGLE-LOT REZONING FORM CNR TO R-2-1 AT 2 61ST PALCE ND-03-16			
PROJECT APPLICANT NAME SCOTT KINSEY			PHONE NUMBER
PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS 333 W OCEAN BLVD	CITY LONG BEACH	STATE CA	ZIP CODE 90802
PROJECT APPLICANT (Check appropriate box): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Public Agency <input type="checkbox"/> School District <input type="checkbox"/> Other Special District <input type="checkbox"/> State Agency <input type="checkbox"/> Private Entity			

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:

<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report (EIR)	\$3,070.00	\$	<u>0.00</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration (ND)(MND)	\$2,210.25	\$	<u>0.00</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Application Fee Water Diversion (State Water Resources Control Board Only)	\$850.00	\$	<u>0.00</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Projects Subject to Certified Regulatory Programs (CRP)	\$1,043.75	\$	<u>0.00</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County Administrative Fee	\$50.00	\$	<u>75.00</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project that is exempt from fees			
<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Exemption			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CDFW No Effect Determination (Form Attached)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____		\$	<u>0.00</u>

PAYMENT METHOD:

<input type="checkbox"/> Cash <input type="checkbox"/> Credit <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Check <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	\$	<u>75.00</u>
--	----	--------------

SIGNATURE <i>X [Signature]</i>	TITLE ITC
-----------------------------------	--------------

Notice of Completion & Environmental Document Transmittal

Mail to: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613
For Hand Delivery/Street Address: 1400 Tenth Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

SCH # 2016091056

Project Title: Single-Lot Rezoning from CNR to R-2-1 at 2 61st Place ND-03-16

Lead Agency: City of Long Beach, Department of Development Services Contact Person: Scott Kinsey, Planner IV
Mailing Address: 333 W. Ocean Blvd., 5th Floor Phone: (562) 570-6194
City: Long Beach Zip: 90802 County: Los Angeles

Project Location: County: Los Angeles City/Nearest Community: Long Beach
Cross Streets: Ocean Blvd./61st Place Zip Code: 90803
Longitude/Latitude (degrees, minutes and seconds): 33 ° 44 ' 53 " N / 118 ° 07 ' 25 " W Total Acres: 0.073
Assessor's Parcel No.: 7245-024-029 Section: Twp.: Range: Base:
Within 2 Miles: State Hwy #: 1 Waterways: Pacific Ocean/San Pedro Bay, Alamitos Bay
Airports: No Railways: No Schools: Yes

Document Type:

CEQA: [] NOP [] Draft EIR NEPA: [] NOI Other: [] Joint Document
[] Early Cons [] Supplement/Subsequent EIR [] EA [] Final Document
[X] Neg Dec (Prior SCH No.) [] Draft EIS [] Other:
[] Mit Neg Dec Other:

Local Action Type:

[] General Plan Update [] Specific Plan [X] Rezone [] Annexation
[] General Plan Amendment [] Master Plan [] Prezone [] Redevelopment
[] General Plan Element [] Planned Unit Development [] Use Permit [X] Coastal Permit
[] Community Plan [] Site Plan [] Land Division (Subdivision, etc.) [X] Other: Local Coastal Plan

Development Type:

[X] Residential: Units 1 Acres 0.073
[] Office: Sq.ft. Acres Employees Transportation: Type
[] Commercial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees Mining: Mineral
[] Industrial: Sq.ft. Acres Employees Power: Type MW
[] Educational: Waste Treatment: Type MGD
[] Recreational: Hazardous Waste: Type
[] Water Facilities: Type MGD Other:

Project Issues Discussed in Document:

[] Aesthetic/Visual [] Fiscal [] Recreation/Parks [] Vegetation
[] Agricultural Land [] Flood Plain/Flooding [] Schools/Universities [] Water Quality
[] Air Quality [] Forest Land/Fire Hazard [] Septic Systems [] Water Supply/Groundwater
[] Archeological/Historical [] Geologic/Seismic [] Sewer Capacity [] Wetland/Riparian
[] Biological Resources [] Minerals [] Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading [] Growth Inducement
[] Coastal Zone [] Noise [] Solid Waste [] Land Use
[] Drainage/Absorption [] Population/Housing Balance [] Toxic/Hazardous [] Cumulative Effects
[] Economic/Jobs [] Public Services/Facilities [] Traffic/Circulation [] Other:

Present Land Use/Zoning/General Plan Designation:

Single-family residential/CNR/LUD No. 2—Mixed Style Homes

Project Description: (please use a separate page if necessary)
See attached project description.

Reviewing Agencies Checklist

Lead Agencies may recommend State Clearinghouse distribution by marking agencies below with and "X". If you have already sent your document to the agency please denote that with an "S".

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Resources Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Historic Preservation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Boating & Waterways, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Office of Public School Construction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Emergency Management Agency | <input type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> California Highway Patrol | <input type="checkbox"/> Pesticide Regulation, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans District # _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Utilities Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Division of Aeronautics | <input type="checkbox"/> Regional WQCB # _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Caltrans Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Central Valley Flood Protection Board | <input type="checkbox"/> Resources Recycling and Recovery, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coachella Valley Mtns. Conservancy | <input type="checkbox"/> S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Comm. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Coastal Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> San Gabriel & Lower L.A. Rivers & Mtns. Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Colorado River Board | <input type="checkbox"/> San Joaquin River Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Santa Monica Mtns. Conservancy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Corrections, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> State Lands Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Delta Protection Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Clean Water Grants |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> SWRCB: Water Rights |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fish & Game Region # _____ | <input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food & Agriculture, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Toxic Substances Control, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry and Fire Protection, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources, Department of |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Services, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Health Services, Department of | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Housing & Community Development | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Native American Heritage Commission | |

Local Public Review Period (to be filled in by lead agency)

Starting Date 9/21/16 Ending Date 10/20/16

Lead Agency (Complete if applicable):

Consulting Firm: <u>N/A</u>	Applicant: <u>Lance Vander Zanden</u>
Address: _____	Address: <u>1500 E. Ocean Blvd., #303</u>
City/State/Zip: _____	City/State/Zip: <u>Long Beach, CA 90803</u>
Contact: _____	Phone: <u>(562) 303-2783</u>
Phone: _____	

Signature of Lead Agency Representative:  Date: 9/20/16

Authority cited: Section 21083, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 21161, Public Resources Code.

Description of project:

The applicant requests a Zone Change from CNR to R-2-I, which would apply to the subject site only, for the purposes of demolishing the existing single-family dwelling and garage, and constructing a new three-story single-family dwelling and garage conforming to the R-2-I development standards. For the purposes of this Initial Study, this project is analyzed as consisting of both the Zone Change, and the demolition of existing improvements and construction of the new single-family dwelling and garage. Throughout this Initial Study, reference to “the project” means the entire scope of the project, including both the Zone Change, and the demolition and construction activities, as described in this section.

The applicant requests this Zone Change from CNR to R-2-I so that the subject residential property would match the zoning of the vast majority of residential properties on The Peninsula, and therefore would enjoy the same residential development rights as the other R-2-I-zoned properties.

The Zone Change request is based upon the differences in the ways the CNR and R-2-I zoning districts allow residential-only development. Table 1 (see below) compares the differences in development standards for the CNR and R-2-I zoning districts for this specific site. On this site, the R-2-I zone would allow the development of a three-story structure containing up to two dwelling units, while the CNR zone allows the development of a two-story structure containing one dwelling unit, with commercial tenant spaces also allowed. For CNR zoning, the number and size of commercial tenant spaces would be limited only by the site’s ability to provide parking spaces in accordance with Chapter 21.41 (Off-Street Parking and Loading) of the Zoning Regulations.

The Zone Change would result in removal of the option for commercial uses. One additional dwelling unit would potentially be allowed (for a total of two), and the effective building height allowed would be four feet higher (see Table 1) than currently allowed. However, the applicant intends to build only one dwelling unit for this project, and construction will be carried out in a way that precludes development of a second dwelling unit (a second unit would require an additional two-car garage, which would not be possible to fit into the proposed site plan). Ultimately, the land use on the site—a single-family dwelling—will not change as a result of the project.

Also, since the project consists of removal of one single-family dwelling, followed by construction of a new single-family dwelling, the affordable housing replacement policy specified in the Local Coastal Program is not applicable to the project (see pages 11-6 and 11-7 of the LCP).

Table 1. Comparison of CNR and R-2-I development standards.

	CNR (Com.)*	CNR (Res.)**	R-2-I
Front yard:	0 ft.	8 ft.	3 ft.
Street side yard (on 61 st Place):	0 ft.	5 ft.	3 ft.
Interior side yard:	5 ft.	5 ft.	3 ft.
Rear yard:	10 ft.	10 ft.	8 ft.
Height limit	2 stories	2 stories	3 stories
To top of flat roof or midpoint of sloped roof	28 ft.	28 ft.	32 ft.
To top of ridge of sloped roof	N/A	N/A	35 ft.
Lot coverage	N/A	N/A	N/A
Required usable open space	250 sq. ft. per unit	250 sq. ft. per unit	2% of lot area per unit (64 sq. ft. for this lot)
Floor area ratio limit	N/A	N/A	N/A
Allowable density (for this site)	1 dwelling unit	1 dwelling unit	2 dwelling units
Amount of commercial space allowed	Limited only by parking provided	N/A	None

Notes:

- * Ground floor commercial, and residential over ground floor commercial development
- ** Ground floor residential, and residential over ground floor residential development
- N/A: Not Applicable

Figure 1. Project Vicinity Map.




Exhibit A

Subject Property:
 2 61st PI
 Application No. 1603-22
 Neg. Dec. No. ND-03-16
 Council District 3
 Zoning Code : CNR




Figure 2. Page 6 of the Zoning Map. Note the lateral extensions of the CNR zoning district on the northern and southern ends of 62nd Street.





Figure 3. Page 6 of General Plan Land Use District Map. Note the lack of a southern extension of LUD No. 7 along Seaside Walk as in the CNR zone above.





Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Ken Alex
Director

October 24, 2016

Scott Kinsey
City of Long Beach
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th floor
Long Beach, CA 92802

Subject: Single-Lot Rezoning from CNR to R-1-I at 2 61st Place ND-03-16
SCH#: 2016091056

Dear Scott Kinsey:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on October 21, 2016, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

**Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base**

SCH# 2016091056
Project Title Single-Lot Rezoning from CNR to R-1-I at 2 61st Place ND-03-16
Lead Agency Long Beach, City of

Type Neg Negative Declaration
Description The applicant requests a zone change from CNR to R-2-I, which would apply to the subject site only, for the purposes of demolishing the existing single family dwelling and garage, and constructing a new three story single family dwelling and garage conforming to the R-2-I development standards. For the purposes of this initial study, this project is analyzed as consisting of both the zone change, and the demolition of existing improvements and construction of the new single family dwelling and garage. Throughout this initial study, reference to the project means the entire scope of the project, including both the zone change, and the demolition and construction activities, as described in this section.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Scott Kinsey
Agency City of Long Beach
Phone (562) 570-6194 **Fax**
email
Address 333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th floor
City Long Beach **State** CA **Zip** 92802

Project Location

County Los Angeles
City Long Beach
Region
Lat / Long 33° 44' 53" N / 118° 07' 25" W
Cross Streets Ocean Blvd/61st Place
Parcel No. 7245-024-029
Township **Range** **Section** **Base**

Proximity to:

Highways 1
Airports
Railways
Waterways Pacific Ocean/San Pedro Bay, Alamitos Bay
Schools
Land Use Single family residential/CNR/LUD No. 2 - mixed style homes

Project Issues

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5; California Coastal Commission; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, District 7; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 4; Native American Heritage Commission

Date Received 09/22/2016 **Start of Review** 09/22/2016 **End of Review** 10/21/2016

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 7-OFFICE OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
100 S. MAIN STREET, MS 16
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
PHONE (213) 897-9140
FAX (213) 897-1337
www.dot.ca.gov



*Serious drought.
Help save water!*

October 20, 2016

Scott Kinsey, Planner IV
City Long Beach
Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau
333 W. Ocean Blvd 5th floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

clear 10/21/16
Governor's Office of Planning & Research
OCT 20 2016
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

RE: Single-Lot Rezoning
from CNR to R-2-1 at 2 61st Place
SCH # 2016091056
GTS# 07-2016-00183
Vic. LA-1/P.M.0.482

Dear Mr. Kinsey:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the proposed negative declaration of Single-Lot Rezoning from CNR to R-2 at 2 61st Place ND-03-16. The applicant requires a Zone Change from CNR to R-2-1, which would apply to the subject site only, for the purposes of demolishing the existing single-family dwelling and garage, and constructing a new three-story single-family dwelling and garage conforming to the R-2-1 development standards.

Based on the information received, the nearest State facility to the proposed project is SR-1. Caltrans does not expect project approval to result in a direct adverse impact to the State facility.

Please note that any work performed within State right of way will require an encroachment permit from Caltrans. In addition, please be reminded that transportation of heavy construction equipment materials, or other special equipment, which require the use of oversized-transport vehicles on State highways will require a Caltrans transportation permit. Caltrans recommends that large size truck trips be limited to off-peak commute hours.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact Melanie Bradford, the project coordinator at (213) 897-9446 and refer to GTS#07-2016-00183.

Sincerely,

DIANNA WATSON, Branch Chief
LD-IGR/CEQA Review

cc: Scott Morgan, State Clearinghouse

FILED
Oct 03 2016

Dean C. Logan, Registrar - Recorder/County Clerk

Electronically signed by SHERON SMITH

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT
NEGATIVE DECLARATION****for the Single-Lot Rezoning from CNR to R-2-I at 2 61st Place**

This serves as the City of Long Beach ("City")'s Notice of Intent to adopt an Initial Study/Negative Declaration for the Single-Lot Rezoning from CNR to R-2-I at 2 61st Place ("Project"), prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), CEQA Guidelines, and local implementation procedures.

Name of Project: Single-Lot Rezoning from CNR to R-2-I at 2 61st Place

Project Location: 2 61st Place, Long Beach, CA 90803

Lead Agency: City of Long Beach, Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Project Description:

The proposed project consists of a Zone Change on a 3,184-sq. ft. lot located at 2 61st Place, currently developed with a single-family dwelling and garage. The zoning designation will be changed from CNR (Neighborhood Commercial and Residential District), a mixed-use zoning district that allows one single-family dwelling and retail commercial space to be built on this particular site at a total of two stories tall, to R-2-I, a two-family residential-only district that allows three-story development. The project also will involve demolition of the existing 2-story single-family dwelling and construction of a new 3-story single-family dwelling. Per *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15072(g)(5), the project site is not listed as a hazardous property as designated under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the City proposes to adopt a Negative Declaration for the above-described project. The Negative Declaration is based on the finding that the project's impacts to the environment will be of a less than significant level. The reasons to support such a finding are documented by an Initial Study prepared by the City. Copies of the Initial Study, the proposed Negative Declaration and supporting materials are available for public review at the following locations:

- City of Long Beach, Development Services Department, 333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor, Long Beach, CA 90802;
- Long Beach Main Library, 101 Pacific Avenue, Long Beach, CA 90802; and
- City of Long Beach website at:
http://www.lbds.info/planning/environmental_planning/environmental_reports.asp

For questions regarding the Negative Declaration contact:

Scott Kinsey, Planner IV

Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau
ATTN: Scott Kinsey
333 W. Ocean Blvd., 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

(562) 570-6194

scott.kinsey@longbeach.gov

THIS NOTICE WAS POSTED

ON October 03 2016

UNTIL November 02 2016

REGISTRAR - RECORDER/COUNTY CLERK

Public Review Period: 30 days Begins - Tues., October 4, 2016 Ends - Thurs., Nov. 3, 2016

In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, any comments concerning the findings of the proposed Initial Study/Negative Declaration must be submitted in writing and **received by the City no later than 4:30 p.m. on the closing date of the public review period as cited above**, in order to be considered prior to the City's final determination on the project. Should you decide to challenge this project, you may be limited to the issues raised during this public review period. Please submit your written comments to: Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau, ATTN: Scott Kinsey, 333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th floor, Long Beach, CA 90802.



State of California – Natural Resources Agency
 DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE
 South Coast Region
 3883 Ruffin Road
 San Diego, CA 92123
www.wildlife.ca.gov

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Governor
 CHARLTON H. BONHAM, Director



CEQA Filing Fee No Effect Determination

Applicant Name and Address: Lance Vander Zanden, 1500 E. Ocean Blvd., Unit 303
 Long Beach, CA 90802

CEQA Lead Agency: City of Long Beach

Project Name: Single-lot Rezoning from CNR to R-2-I at 2 61st Place ND-03-16

CEQA Document Type: Negative Declaration (ND-03-16)

State Clearing House Number and/or local agency ID number: N/A

Project Location: 2 61st Place, Long Beach.

Project Description: Zone Change and Local Coastal Development Permit on a 3,184-sq. ft. lot located at 2 61st Place, in conjunction with the demolition of an existing two-story single-family dwelling, and construction of a new three-story single-family dwelling. The proposed project consists of a Zone Change and Local Coastal Development Permit on a 3,184-sq. ft. lot located at 2 61st Place, currently developed with a single-family dwelling and garage. The zoning designation will be changed from CNR (Neighborhood Commercial and Residential District), a mixed-use zoning district that allows one single-family dwelling and retail commercial space to be built on this particular site at a total of two stories tall, to R-2-I, a two-family residential-only district that allows three-story development. The project also will involve demolition of the existing 2-story single-family dwelling and construction of a new 3-story single-family dwelling. Per CEQA Guidelines Section 15072(g)(5), the project site is not listed as a hazardous property as designated under Section 65962.5 of the Government Code.

Determination: Based on a review of the project as proposed, the Department of Fish and Wildlife has determined that for purposes of the assessment of CEQA filing fees (Fish and Game Code [FGC] Section 711.4(c)) the project has no effect on fish, wildlife or their habitat and the project as described does not require payment of a CEQA filing fee. This determination does not in any way imply that the project is exempt from CEQA and does not determine the significance of any potential project effects evaluated pursuant to CEQA.

Please retain this original determination for your records. Local lead agencies are required to file two copies of this determination with the county clerk at time of filing of the Notice of Determination (NOD) after the project is approved. State lead agencies are required to file two copies of this determination with the Office of Planning and Research (State Clearinghouse) at the time of filing the NOD. If you do not file a copy of this determination as appropriate with the county clerk or State Clearinghouse at the time of filing of the NOD, the appropriate CEQA filing fee will be due and payable.

Without a valid CEQA Filing Fee No Effect Determination form or proof of fee payment, the project will not be operative, vested, or final and any local permits issued for the project will be invalid, pursuant to FGC Section 711.4(c)(3).

DFW Approved By: Scott P. Harris _____ Scott P. Harris Date: 09/22/2016

Title: Environmental Scientist

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



INITIAL STUDY and NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Single-Lot Rezoning from CNR to R-2-I at 2 61st Place

2 61st Place, Long Beach

ND-03-16

September 2016

Prepared by:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services | Planning Bureau

INITIAL STUDY

Project Title:

Single-Lot Rezoning from CNR to R-2-I at 2 61st Place

Lead agency name and address:

City of Long Beach
Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Contact person and phone number:

Scott Kinsey, Planner IV
(562) 570-6194

Project location:

2 61st Place
Long Beach, CA 90802

Project Sponsor's name and contact information:

Lance Vander Zanden
1500 E. Ocean Blvd., Unit 303
Long Beach, CA 90802-6926
(562) 303-2783

General Plan:

Land Use Designation (LUD) No. 2: Mixed Style Homes Districts

Zoning:

CNR – Neighborhood Commercial and Residential District

Existing setting:

The subject site is located at the address 2 61st Place in The Peninsula neighborhood of Long Beach. The site is a 3,184-square foot residential lot improved with a two-story single-family home and a garage.

The site is located in the CNR (Neighborhood Commercial and Residential) zoning district, a mixed-use commercial zone that allows for residential development. CNR allows neighborhood-compatible commercial uses in a manner very similar to the commercial-only CNP (Neighborhood Pedestrian) zoning district, while also allowing residential development at the density allowed by the R-3-T zoning district. In The Peninsula neighborhood, the vast majority of private land is zoned R-2-I, with the exception of a strip of CNR zoning for all of the parcels with frontage on 62nd Place, and extensions at either end of the strip to include additional parcels with frontage on Seaside

Walk (to the south) or Bay Shore Walk (to the north) between 61st Place and 63rd Place. The subject site is part of this CNR strip, and is the last parcel on the western edge of southern extension of the CNR district, having frontage on Seaside Walk and abutting 61st Place. Parcels immediately abutting the subject site to the north, and across 61st Place to the west, are zoned R-2-I (see Figures 1 and 2, and page 6 of the Zoning Map Book).

The Zoning Regulations (Title 21, Long Beach Municipal Code) describes the R-2-I zoning district as a two-family residential district with small lots, which recognizes existing subdivision and use patterns in distinct portions of the City, and allows an intensity of development appropriate only in areas within immediate proximity to public open space, and notes that the R-2-I zone implements Land Use District (LUD) No. 2 of the General Plan. In the case of The Peninsula, which is the only place in the City where R-2-I zoning is present, the public open space referenced in the zoning district description is the wide public beach found on both sides of The Peninsula.

A majority of buildings in The Peninsula neighborhood are two stories tall, but a significant number of three-story structures are found in the area as well. Most are a mixture of low- and medium-low density housing types between one and four units on a lot. A number of four-story, medium-high-density multifamily apartment/condominium buildings are located between 61st and 63rd Places, in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. A total of three commercial uses are present, out of the group of 37 buildings (having 49 separate addresses) located in the strip of CNR district. All of the 3 commercial uses are located on 62nd Place north of Ocean Boulevard. The subject site is south of Ocean Boulevard.

Although the subject site currently has a zoning designation of CNR, it is located in the same General Plan Land Use District as the R-2-I-zoned areas of The Peninsula, which is LUD No. 2—Mixed Style Homes (see Figure 3, and page 6 of the General Plan Map of Land Use Districts). LUD No. 2 recognizes the existing conditions in large areas of the City, including The Peninsula neighborhood, where a mixture of low-density housing types, consisting of single-family homes, duplexes, triplexes, etc., are present on the same block faces and in the same neighborhood. These situations exist, according to the Land Use Element, as a result of these areas having been zoned for higher density housing in the past, the buildout of which was only partially accomplished. The purpose of LUD No. 2 is stated to be preservation of the existing mixture of housing types and density situation, without requiring a density reduction to single-family density levels, nor allowing an advance in density to that of the densest housing prevalent in districts of LUD No. 2 (this typically would be 4+ units on a lot of comparable size to the subject site).

The strip of CNR zoning district that covers the lots fronting on 62nd Place, along with the northern extension of CNR along the lots fronting on Bay Shore Walk between 61st Place and 63rd Place, fall under a different LUD, which is LUD No. 7—Mixed Use District. However, for those lots located within the southern extension of the CNR district along Seaside Walk between 61st Place and 63rd Place, not having frontage on 62nd Place, LUD No. 2 remains the General Plan LUD designation (see Figure 3, and page 6 of the General

Plan Map of Land Use Districts). The historical reason for this disparity between the General Plan LUD and the zoning district is not clear.

The project site also is located within the Coastal Zone, and subject to the City's certified Local Coastal Program (LCP). It is located within the LCP's Area E—Naples Island and The Peninsula (see pages III-E-1 through III-E-22 of the LCP). Area E emphasizes maintaining and improving access to the coast, and preservation of the existing residential character of The Peninsula, with a duplex density to prevail. The Area E implementation plan also acknowledges the trend toward three-story development among the residential buildings located on The Peninsula. The LCP specifically calls for a strip of mixed-use commercial zoning along 62nd Place to create a commercial node or axis, but is silent regarding the extension of this zoning beyond 62nd place along Bay Shore Walk and Seaside Walk between 61st and 63rd Places.

The LCP additionally aims to protect the existing amount of affordable housing within the Coastal Zone, requiring one-for-one replacement of any very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing units removed as the result of a project (see pages II-6 through II-14 of the LCP). However, the LCP goes on to exempt from this requirement any removals for the purpose of construction of one or two new residential units.

Description of project:

The applicant requests a Zone Change from CNR to R-2-I, which would apply to the subject site only, for the purposes of demolishing the existing single-family dwelling and garage, and constructing a new three-story single-family dwelling and garage conforming to the R-2-I development standards. For the purposes of this Initial Study, this project is analyzed as consisting of both the Zone Change, and the demolition of existing improvements and construction of the new single-family dwelling and garage. Throughout this Initial Study, reference to "the project" means the entire scope of the project, including both the Zone Change, and the demolition and construction activities, as described in this section.

The applicant requests this Zone Change from CNR to R-2-I so that the subject residential property would match the zoning of the vast majority of residential properties on The Peninsula, and therefore would enjoy the same residential development rights as the other R-2-I-zoned properties.

The Zone Change request is based upon the differences in the ways the CNR and R-2-I zoning districts allow residential-only development. Table 1 (see below) compares the differences in development standards for the CNR and R-2-I zoning districts for this specific site. On this site, the R-2-I zone would allow the development of a three-story structure containing up to two dwelling units, while the CNR zone allows the development of a two-story structure containing one dwelling unit, with commercial tenant spaces also allowed. For CNR zoning, the number and size of commercial tenant spaces would be

limited only by the site’s ability to provide parking spaces in accordance with Chapter 21.41 (Off-Street Parking and Loading) of the Zoning Regulations.

The Zone Change would result in removal of the option for commercial uses. One additional dwelling unit would potentially be allowed (for a total of two), and the effective building height allowed would be four feet higher (see Table 1) than currently allowed. However, the applicant intends to build only one dwelling unit for this project, and construction will be carried out in a way that precludes development of a second dwelling unit (a second unit would require an additional two-car garage, which would not be possible to fit into the proposed site plan). Ultimately, the land use on the site—a single-family dwelling—will not change as a result of the project.

Also, since the project consists of removal of one single-family dwelling, followed by construction of a new single-family dwelling, the affordable housing replacement policy specified in the Local Coastal Program is not applicable to the project (see pages II-6 and II-7 of the LCP).

Table 1. Comparison of CNR and R-2-I development standards.

	CNR (Com.)*	CNR (Res.)**	R-2-I
Front yard:	0 ft.	8 ft.	3 ft.
Street side yard (on 61 st Place):	0 ft.	5 ft.	3 ft.
Interior side yard:	5 ft.	5 ft.	3 ft.
Rear yard:	10 ft.	10 ft.	8 ft.
Height limit	2 stories	2 stories	3 stories
To top of flat roof or midpoint of sloped roof	28 ft.	28 ft.	32 ft.
To top of ridge of sloped roof	N/A	N/A	35 ft.
Lot coverage	N/A	N/A	N/A
Required usable open space	250 sq. ft. per unit	250 sq. ft. per unit	2% of lot area per unit (64 sq. ft. for this lot)
Floor area ratio limit	N/A	N/A	N/A
Allowable density (for this site)	1 dwelling unit	1 dwelling unit	2 dwelling units
Amount of commercial space allowed	Limited only by parking provided	N/A	None

Notes:

- * Ground floor commercial, and residential over ground floor commercial development
- ** Ground floor residential, and residential over ground floor residential development
- N/A: Not Applicable

Figure 1. Project Vicinity Map.




Figure 2. Page 6 of the Zoning Map. Note the lateral extensions of the CNR zoning district on the northern and southern ends of 62nd Street.





Figure 3. Page 6 of General Plan Land Use District Map. Note the lack of a southern extension of LUD No. 7 along Seaside Walk as in the CNR zone above.



Public agencies whose approval is required:

Long Beach City Planning Commission
Long Beach City Council
California Coastal Commission on appeal

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:

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation & Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Scott Kinsey
Planner IV

9/20/16

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are supported adequately by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parenthesis following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analysis,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration (per Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effect were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

I. AESTHETICS

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is located in The Peninsula neighborhood of Long Beach, on the first lot adjacent to the beach and Pacific Ocean, in an area of compact and densely-developed residential buildings ranging from one to four stories tall. The project will allow development of a three-story residential structure up to a height limit of 32 feet to the top of parapet wall for a flat roof, or to the midpoint of a sloped roof (with an additional limit of 35 feet to top of ridge if a sloped roof is used) under the development standards of the R-2-I zoning district. The project will not substantially affect or alter views toward the beach and Pacific Ocean. Numerous buildings in the project vicinity are developed at the same or taller building height as the proposed project, including several buildings in the immediate vicinity that are four stories tall. No public views (i.e., from Ocean Boulevard or 62nd Place, or likewise from Seaside Way or the public beach) would be affected by the project. Furthermore, the change in zoning from CNR to R-2-I represents a four-foot (4') increase in allowable height from the site's current zoning, CNR, which allows a two-story commercial or residential structure up to a height limit of 28 feet. Many buildings in the project vicinity are nonconforming to the existing CNR and R-2-I zoning development standards, and allowing development conforming to the R-2-I standards would not create a substantial impact upon a scenic vista. Many other under-developed building sites in the vicinity are located the R-2-I district, which affords the same by-right development potential, including a three story height, as would result from the project. Given the existing development pattern and state of the immediate surroundings, the project will constitute a less than significant impact upon scenic vistas, and no mitigation is required.

b. Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is located on an existing parcel currently improved with a single-family dwelling and garage, which will be demolished for construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage as a result of the project. No trees, rock outcroppings, historic buildings within a State scenic highway, or other scenic resources are located upon the project site. The project will not result in any impacts to scenic resources, and no mitigation is required.

c. Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. The zone change will allow construction of a new single-family dwelling up to a height limit four feet (4') taller than the currently-allowed height limit for the project site. The existing single-family dwelling and garage will be demolished, and replaced with a new single-family dwelling and garage. This will have a less than significant impact upon the visual character and quality of the site, and upon the visual character and quality of its surroundings, and no mitigation is required.

d. Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. This would include new exterior lighting, and interior lighting potentially visible through the building's windows from dusk to dawn. These light sources will be of the type and character associated with a single-family residence. Long Beach Municipal Code prohibits the trespass of light and glare upon adjacent residential properties, and this would be enforced as a matter of course. The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. The project will have a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

a. Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

b. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

c. Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))??

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- 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 or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

For items **a.** through **e.**: The project site is not located on any type of farmland or within an agricultural zone, and there are no agricultural zones within the vicinity of the project. The project site does not consist of forest land or timberland, nor is it in the vicinity of forest land or timberland. The project will not cause any changes in the existing environment that could cause loss or conversion of farmland, forest land, or timberland to non-agricultural, non-forest, or non-timberland use. The project site is a fully-developed parcel improved with one- and two-story buildings comprising a single-family dwelling and garage, and after the project is carried out, it will lead to demolition of the existing structures and construction of a new three-story single-family dwelling and attached garage. Furthermore, the subject site is located within an area of the City that is developed with commercial and residential land uses. The project will not result in any impacts on farmland, agricultural zoning, or forest land, and no mitigation is required.

III. AIR QUALITY

The City of Long Beach is located within the South Coast Air Basin, which is subject to some of the worst air pollution in the nation, attributable to its topography, climate, meteorological conditions, large population base, and dispersed urban land use patterns.

Air quality conditions are affected by the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by climatic conditions that influence the movement and dispersion of pollutants. Atmospheric forces such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local and regional topography, determine how air pollutant emissions affect air quality.

The natural environment of the South Coast Air Basin has a limited capability to disperse air contaminants because of its low wind speeds and persistent temperature inversions. In the Long Beach area, predominantly daily winds consist of morning onshore airflow from the southwest at a mean speed of 7.3 miles per hour and afternoon and evening offshore airflow from the northwest at 0.2 to 4.7 miles per hour with little variability between seasons. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. The prevailing winds carry air contaminants northward and then eastward over Whittier, Covina, Pomona and Riverside.

The majority of pollutants found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are produced mostly by sources other than automobile exhaust.

a. Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality attainment plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is located within the City of Long Beach, which is part of the South Coast Air Basin and under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD's *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* establishes the current guidelines and emission thresholds for assessment of potential air quality impacts. This *Air Quality Handbook* includes a consistency finding to determine whether a project is inconsistent with the assumptions and objectives of the SCAQMD's *Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)*. In addition, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the sub-region in which it is located, it is consistent with the AQMP, and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategies specified in the AQMP.

The project will not add any new structures that would create substantial employment or housing demands. Since this project is not considered significantly growth inducing, there would be no inconsistencies with either the SCAG growth forecasts or the AQMP and therefore no further analysis is required. The project will have a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

b. Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Both the State of California and the Federal government have established ambient air quality standards for the following air pollutants: carbon monoxide, ozone, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, particulate matter less than 10 and 2.5 microns in diameter, and lead. Ozone is formed by a photochemical reaction between nitrogen oxides and reactive organic gases, and therefore ozone impacts are assessed by evaluating these two sources.

The project will result in the demolition of a single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. During the construction phase, worker vehicle trips and construction equipment air quality impacts would be the same as those anticipated for the construction of a single-family dwelling at generally any location within the City, and would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. City of Long Beach construction permitting and inspection requirements will control air

quality impacts during demolition and construction activities that are typically associated with construction of this scale, as a matter of course, and the project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

c. Would the project 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)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. The project would not result in any cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants. The land use at the site, a single-family residence, would not ultimately be changed as a result of the project. Demolition and construction impacts will be of a limited nature typically associated with single-family dwelling construction projects. The project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

d. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* defines sensitive receptors as children, elderly and sick individuals that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the population at large. Facilities that serve various types of sensitive receptors, including schools, hospitals, and senior care centers, are located throughout the City.

The project will not create or emit substantial pollutant concentrations that could impact sensitive receptors off-site, nor is it a facility that would serve sensitive receptors who could be impacted by pollutant concentrations released or emitted from off-site sources. Any air quality impacts as a result of demolition and construction activities would be limited in scope to those typically associated with single-family dwelling construction projects, and the project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. Potential sources of odors from construction activities include use of architectural coatings and solvents, and diesel-powered construction equipment. SCAQMD Rule 1113 limits the amount of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from architectural coatings and solvents, which lowers odorous emissions.

Construction activities that result from the project could generate some airborne odors typically associated with vehicles and equipment, such as engine exhaust, as well as architectural coatings, paints, adhesives, or solvents. However, project related construction odors would be emitted from localized sources and would not emanate far from the sources. Such odors are therefore considered isolated to the building site and would not disperse significant odor levels beyond the immediate project vicinity. The existing and resultant land use, as a single-family dwelling, would not change, and would not emit any objectionable odors that could affect a substantial number of people. The project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

a. Would the project have a substantial adverse impact, 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

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

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

c. Would the project 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

d. Would the project 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

e. Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

f. Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

For a, b, c, d, e and f—The project site is located within an urbanized portion of the City, and is surrounded by existing residential land uses. No riparian habitats or wetlands areas or habitats are present on or near the subject site. No mature trees,

or any trees of a specially-designated or protected species, are present. The site presently consists of a two-story single-family residence with an attached one-story garage. The vegetation on site consists of common urban residential landscape species. No evidence exists of rare or sensitive species as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations or Title 50 of the Federal Code of Regulations. The biological habitat and species diversity in the surrounding area is limited to that typically found in highly populated and urbanized Southern California settings.

The project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, and the construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage on the site. No substantial impacts will be caused to any candidate, sensitive, or special status species. The project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with any established wildlife corridors, and will not impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. The project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other habitat conservation plan. No riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or Federally protected wetlands exist on site or in the immediate vicinity of the site. Therefore, the project will not conflict with any local, State, or Federal policies, plans, or ordinances protecting biological resources. The project will not result in any impacts upon biological resources, and no mitigation is required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Some evidence indicates that primitive peoples inhabited portions of the City as early as 5,000 to 2,000 B.C. Much of the remains and artifacts of these ancient peoples were destroyed during the first century of the City's development.

a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site and its current improvements (a single-family dwelling and garage) do not constitute a historic resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The site and building are not included in any Federal, State, or local register of historic resources, nor are the site or structure historically significant independent of the fact that they are not listed in any register of historic resources. The existing structure originally was constructed in 1948, and represents a relatively nondescript example of wood-lap siding postwar residential architecture. Additionally, the structure on the site appears to be a mix of non-complementary architectural elements, with the one-story portion having a ranch-home-style hip

roof, and the two story portion having a flat/parapet roof. The site and improvements do not meet the criteria for a historic resource: the site is not associated with significant events, important persons, or distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; representing the work of an important creative individual; or does not possess high artistic values. Therefore, the project, which will result in demolition of these structures, will have a less than significant impact to historical resources.

b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

No known archaeological resources exist on the project site. However, the site may have a sensitivity to unknown resources due to its proximity to the Pacific Ocean and the area that later became Alamitos Bay. Although it is not expected that archaeological resources would be encountered during construction, due to previous disturbance to the site during its initial construction, the project would require limited excavation to remove the existing foundations and footings, and possibly additional, limited, excavation to place the foundations and footings for the new structure.

Assembly Bill (AB) 52 mandates an analysis of potential impacts to tribal cultural resources under CEQA. Pursuant to California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 21074, a tribal cultural resource must meet one of the following criteria: 1) included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; 2) included in a local register of historical resources; 3) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in PRC Section 5024.1; 4) a cultural landscape that meets one of the above criteria and is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape; and/or 5) a historical resource described in PRC 21084.1, a unique archaeological resource described in PRC 21083.2 or a non-unique archaeological resource if it conforms to the above criteria.

In accordance with the requirements of AB 52, the City of Long Beach distributed letters to numerous Native American tribes notifying each tribe of the opportunity to consult with the City regarding the proposed project. The tribes were identified based on a list provided by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), or were tribes that had previously requested to be notified of future projects within the City. The letters were distributed in August 2016. Two responses were received from tribal contacts, with one initiating consultation with the City. This tribal contact did not identify the site as a specific known or likely location for tribal cultural

resources, but requested that a tribal cultural resources monitor be allowed to be present at the construction site during all ground-disturbing activity phases. The City will diligently ensure that the tribal resources monitor is allowed access to the construction site during ground-disturbing activities, and if any potential archaeological or cultural resources are encountered, construction will be stopped per the City's standard construction requirements so that the potential resources can be assessed and evaluated by a qualified expert in accordance with State law and local requirements. However, given the level of previous disturbance to the project site, and the limited scope of the proposed construction and associated excavation, it is not expected that any tribal cultural resources meeting AB 52 criteria would occur on the project site. The City will continue to comply with and enforce compliance with the requirements of AB 52 throughout the construction process. The proposed project would not have a significant impact to a tribal cultural resource, as defined in PRC Section 21074, and will therefore have a less than significant impact to archaeological/tribal cultural resources.

c. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

As discussed in **V-b**, the site is located within a highly-developed area and the project site was previously disturbed during its initial construction in 1948. No known paleontological resources exist within the project site. Due to the existing disturbed condition, the proximity of the Pacific Ocean, and the expected shallow depth of excavation with regards to paleontological resources, it is not expected that paleontological resources would be encountered during construction. In the unlikely event that such resources are discovered during the ground-disturbing phase of construction, construction would be stopped per the City's standard requirements and regulations, and the potential resource would be assessed and evaluated by a qualified expert in accordance with local requirements and State law. Project impacts to unique paleontological resources will be less than significant.

d. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

No conditions exist that suggest human remains are likely to be found on the project site. Due to the level of past disturbance of the site, it is not anticipated that human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, would be

encountered during excavation or ground-disturbing activities. If human remains are found, those remains would require proper treatment, in accordance with applicable laws. California Public Resources Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 describes the requirements if any human remains are accidentally discovered during excavation of a site. As required by State law, the requirements and procedures set forth in Section 5097.98 of the California Public Resources Code would be implemented, including notification of the County Coroner, notification of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), and consultation with the individual identified by the NAHC to be the “most likely descendent.” If human remains are found during excavation, excavation must stop in the vicinity of the find and any area that is reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent remains, until the County Coroner has been summoned, and the remains have been investigated and appropriate recommendations have been made for the treatment and disposition of the remains. Following compliance with existing State regulations, which detail the appropriate actions necessary in the event human remains are encountered, the project’s impacts in this area will be less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

a. Would the project 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.**

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

According to the City’s Seismic Safety Element, earthquake history has shown that the most likely place for surface fault rupture to occur is on an existing fault. According to Plate 2 of the Seismic Safety Element, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (name changed from Special Study Zone on January 1, 1994) or within a Caution Zone for Essential and Hazardous Facilities. A review of the currently-published California Division of Mines and Geology Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone maps (Long Beach, Los Alamitos, and Seal Beach quadrangles, effective July 1, 1986) confirmed that the information on Plate 2 of the Seismic Safety Element relevant to this project is still current. The nearest delineated fault, the Newport-Inglewood Fault, runs northwest-to-southeast about 1.3 miles northeast of the project site. Therefore, the project site is not exposed to significant danger that would result from surface rupture of a

known fault underneath or in the direct vicinity of the project site. Also, project implementation would not significantly increase the exposure of people or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects involving fault rupture. Based on known hazards, the project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

According to Plate 6 of the City's Seismic Safety Element, the project site is located in Ground Shaking Area 1, an area of "deep soil conditions with deep alluvium in gap areas." According to the analysis of ground shaking potential in the Seismic Safety Element, each of the three major areas of soil conditions found in the City are at nearly equal potential for strong seismicity.

According to the Seismic Safety Element:

"The intensity of ground shaking, as represented by tabulations of peak ground acceleration versus return period in Appendix D, indicates high seismicity for the Long Beach area. To mitigate the consequences of this high level of seismicity in terms of ground shaking, requires significant design strengthening of structures to resist earthquake loading. One rational means for design, considering the frequency response of structures and the intensity of ground shaking, is the use of response spectrum. An evaluation of response spectrum for the City of Long Beach for each of the three ground shaking zones shown on Plate 6 was made, and the results are tabulated in Appendix E. These values were developed for general information and to define the ground shaking zone only. It is important that individual designs of structures take into account the specific subsurface conditions of a site, and that the response spectra used should be developed on a case-by-case basis. The spectra data listed in Appendix E should be used for comparison purposes only.

"The actual method of design against shaking should consider the importance of the structure, the complexity of the structure, and the occupancy requirements of the structure. To provide guidelines for design, structures have been divided into groups on Table 6, relating structure type and location to the minimum design procedures that should be used. In some cases, the actual minimum design procedures may be more critical than indicated in Table 6, as dictated by other jurisdictional authorities. Because of the high seismicity of the area, it is prudent for the structural engineer and geotechnical engineer to consider innovative aseismic design procedures and mitigation. For ground shaking, this could include the use of base isolation or time-history analysis of the structure to develop the plastic response and identify areas of the structure where strengthening is important."

Per Table 6 of the Seismic Safety Element, building code requirements are considered the minimum design standard for the proposed type of structure located in Ground Shaking Area 1. As stated in the Seismic Element, it is important for proper seismic protection to be engineered for each building project on a case-by-case and site-by-site basis. This seismic protection will be required to be designed and engineered into this specific project as part of the building permitting process; also the proposed construction consists of a single-family dwelling, and is not a safety-critical structure that could expose a significant number of persons to strong seismic ground shaking-related hazards. The project itself will not change the physical conditions on the site and will not increase or change the exposure of persons to the hazards of strong seismic ground shaking. For these reasons, the project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

According to the City’s Seismic Safety Element, “The potential for liquefaction in Long Beach depends on the levels of shaking described in Section 6.3, the ground water conditions described in Section 5.3, and the subsurface soil conditions described in Section 5.2.” Additionally,

“The consequences for liquefaction in areas designated as having a significant potential for liquefaction includes possible horizontal failure by lateral spreading and instability of containment dikes where they are present, the occurrence of sand boils and differential settlements of the order of several inches to a foot or more. In areas where liquefaction is rated as moderate, the consequences would likely be more subtly characterized by settlements of a few inches and possible sand boils.”

Per Plate 7 of the Seismic Safety Element, the project site is located in an area where liquefaction potential is *significant* (the highest of the four categories of liquefaction potential identified in the Seismic Safety Element, which include *potential minimal, potential low, potential moderate, and potential significant*). The Seismic Safety Element states, “Because of the potentially significant effects of liquefaction, it should be treated as a significant hazard for which a site should be investigated if the potential is moderate or significant as in the case for faulting. Therefore, similar guidelines have been developed for liquefaction as was done for surface faulting.”

The Seismic Safety Element then describes two different guidelines for dealing with projects in liquefaction zones of moderate and significant potential. One guideline is for essential facilities, such as hospitals, schools, police and fire stations, etc., a category that does not include the proposed single-family dwelling.

The other guideline is specified “for all other facilities,” which would include the proposed single-family dwelling. This guideline requires a subsurface investigation, logged and supervised by a geotechnical engineer, to evaluate the potential for liquefaction beneath the proposed structure. The guideline concludes by stating, “If the subsurface investigation indicates the potential for liquefaction, the consequences of liquefaction shall be identified and the structure strengthened to reduce the chance of building collapse.”

This requirement for a geotechnical study is aligned with the standard practice used by the City’s Building & Safety Bureau during the plan check and permitting process. A senior civil engineer in the Building & Safety Bureau’s Plan Check Engineering Division indicated that the developer would be required to provide for the geotechnical study, and comply with all recommendations enumerated by the geotechnical engineer in designing the proposed structure.

The City’s design, engineering, and permitting requirements for a new single-family dwelling in a liquefaction zone require the potential effects of liquefaction to be adequately identified, and require the building to be designed and constructed in a manner that mitigates the potential adverse effects of liquefaction; additionally, the proposed single-family dwelling would be required to be constructed in conformance with all current State and local building codes relative to seismic safety. Additionally, the project itself will not alter the physical conditions at the site and will not increase or change the exposure of persons to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. For these reasons, the project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

iv) Landslides?

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|

According to the Seismic Safety Element, “Slope instability during earthquakes can be an important aspect of seismic ground failure. The areas most susceptible to this condition are those where slopes are steep, soils are weak or cohesionless, bedding dips out of the slope, and ground water is present.” Plate 9 of the Seismic Safety Element, “Slope Stability Study Areas,” identifies Areas of Relatively Steep Slopes within the City. The project site not within the Areas of Relatively Steep Slopes, meaning it is outside the area where landslides could reasonably be expected to occur. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is covered with landscaping, hardscape, and a single-family dwelling and garage. The project will result in the demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. The remainder of the site not covered by building footprint will be covered by landscaping or hardscape. The project will result in the construction of a new single-family dwelling, which will not involve any work that could expose a significant area of ground surface to substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. During construction, compliance will be required, as a matter of course through the construction permitting process, with all best management practices for runoff prevention, fugitive dust control, and related measures that prevent occurrence of a situation that could result in substantial soil erosion or topsoil loss during a heavy rain or high wind event. The project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

c. Would the project 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is located in an area where liquefaction potential is significant (see discussion of liquefaction in **VI-a-iii** above). Areas of high liquefaction potential are associated with significant risk for effects such as lateral spreading, differential settlement, earthquake-induced settlement, or sand boils, as these coincide with those areas at high risk for liquefaction. According to Plate 3 of the Seismic Safety Element, the project site is located in Soil Profile A, which is made up of predominately man-made fill areas consisting of hydraulic-fills, assorted man-made fills, and soils of questionable origin, generally composed of fine sand and silt.

The project will result in the construction of a new single-family dwelling. As discussed in **VI-a-iii** above, the City's standard practice during the plan check and permitting process for a site in a liquefaction zone will require preparation of a geotechnical report by a geotechnical engineer, and the developer will be required to adhere to all recommendations identified in the geotechnical report. The City's design, engineering, and permitting requirements for a new single-family dwelling in a liquefaction zone require the potential effects of liquefaction to be adequately

identified, and require the building to be designed and constructed in a manner that mitigates the potential adverse effects of liquefaction. Additionally, the proposed single-family dwelling would be required to be constructed in conformance with all current State and local building codes relative to seismic safety. For these reasons, the project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

d. Would the project 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the construction of a new single-family dwelling. Applicable building codes will require investigation for and the removal of expansive soil, if any is present, to a depth sufficient to eliminate any potential hazards the expansive soil could present to the new structure that will be constructed as a result of the project. The project therefore will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

e. Would the project 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 wastewater?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Sewer service is in place for the subject site. Septic tanks or an alternative wastewater disposal system will not be used, and the project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

a. Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of a single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. This project would be otherwise categorically exempt were it not for the proposed zone change component. Greenhouse gas emissions from the project would be at the level typically associated with single-family dwelling-scale construction work, consisting of a small number of construction workers' vehicles (likely 5 to 10) plus a small number (1 to 3) of small-scale pieces of heavy equipment if needed for short phases of the construction work. Following construction, the land use at the site would be the same (a single-family dwelling) as it was before the project. Any greenhouse gas emission-related impacts resulting from the project would have a less than significant impact on the environment, and no mitigation is required.

b. Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of a single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. Greenhouse gas emissions from the project would be at the level typically associated with single-family dwelling-scale construction work. The land use at the site would remain the same, before and after the project, and would not result in a conflict with a plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

a. Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, followed by construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. The demolition phase has the potential to expose or uncover building materials containing asbestos and lead-based paint that are typically associated with residential construction from the 1970s and earlier. However, the handling and disposal of any hazardous or potentially hazardous materials would be required to comply with SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Demolition and Renovation Activities)

as well as Long Beach Municipal Code Chapters 8.86 (Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory), 8.87 (Hazardous Waste Control), and 8.88 (Hazardous Materials Cleanup). In addition, the project must comply with California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA) regulations regarding lead-based materials. California Code of Regulations Section 1532.1 requires the testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials to ensure exposure levels do not exceed CalOSHA standards. Post-construction, the single-family dwelling would not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. For these reasons, the project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

b. Would the project 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

This project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. Construction impacts related to hazardous materials associated with demolition of residential construction from the 1970s and earlier are discussed above in **VII-a**. The project will not consist of any land use that could be at risk for upset or accident conditions involving release of hazardous materials into the environment. The project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

c. Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The subject site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school, Naples Elementary, a public elementary school of the Long Beach Unified School District, is located one-half mile to the northwest. No new schools currently are proposed in the vicinity. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

d. Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. The Cortese List does not list the proposed project site as contaminated with hazardous materials. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or public-use airport. The nearest airport is the Los Alamitos Army Airfield within the Los Alamitos Joint Forces Training Center. It is located approximately 3.8 miles to the northeast. The Long Beach Municipal Airport is located approximately 4 miles to the north. The project will result in the demolition and construction of a single-family dwelling, and will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

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 Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, and no private airstrips are located nearby in Los Angeles or Orange Counties. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

g. Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will take place on an existing, established residential lot. The project will not result in any changes to public or private roads or other rights-of-way. The project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

h. Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is located within an urbanized setting and is not adjacent to or intermixed with wild lands. The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Federal Emergency Management Agency has prepared a new series of Flood Insurance Rate Maps designating potential flood zones (based on the projected inundation limits for breach of the Hansen Dam and that of the Whittier Narrows Dam, as well as the 100-year flood as delineated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers), which was adopted in July 1998 and updated in January 2002.

a. Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. The new structure

will potentially cause runoff of excess rainwater into the storm drain system, and discharge of volumes of wastewater normally associated with a single-family residence into the sewer system. The City's Low Impact Development (LID) standards will apply to this project, requiring on-site capture and retention of a specified amount of rainwater for each rain event. During construction, the builder will be required to comply with all best management practices for prevention of runoff and stormwater pollution, as a matter of course. The sewer and storm drain infrastructure that will service the project already is developed and in place. The project will be required to comply with all Federal, State and local requirements pertaining to water quality. The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

b. Would the project 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)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies, either through groundwater extraction or through covering of a greater surface area with impervious materials, in a way that would lead to a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. The project will be required to comply with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) requirements, which require capture and on-site retention of a specified amount of rainwater for each rain event, which will reduce the net runoff from the site. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

c. Would the project 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 that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will not alter the course of any stream or river, or affect any other drainage pattern, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation off-site. The project site consists of a small, developed residential lot with no watercourses. All storm drain infrastructure for the site is in place. The City's Low

Impact Development (LID) standards will apply to this project, requiring on-site capture and retention of a specified amount of rainwater for each rain event. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

d. Would the project 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 that would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner that could result in flooding on- or off-site. All storm drain infrastructure for the project is in place. The project will be required to comply with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) requirements, which require capture and on-site retention of a specified amount of rainwater for each rain event, which will reduce the net runoff from the site. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

e. Would the project create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will not create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of the existing storm drain infrastructure, and the project will not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. The project will result in the construction of a new single-family dwelling on a small residential lot. This construction will be required to comply with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) requirements, which require capture and on-site retention of a specified amount of rainwater for each rain event, which will reduce the net runoff from the site. Any activities during the construction phase that could impact water quality will be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge and Elimination System (NPDES) standards. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

f. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. The project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, and the construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage, on an existing small residential lot. The project will not alter any bodies of water, rivers, streams, groundwater, or aquifers. All water supply, sewer, and storm water infrastructure to serve the project already is in place and will not be altered. The project will not involve any land use that will create polluted runoff or discharge. The project will be required to comply with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) requirements, which require capture and on-site retention of a specified amount of rainwater for each rain event, which will reduce the net runoff from the site. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

g. Would the project 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The proposed project is located in Flood Zone X, outside the 100-year flood hazard area. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

h. Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The proposed project is located in Flood Zone X, outside the 100-year flood hazard area. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

i. Would the project 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The City's Seismic Safety Element states, "The failure of structures that might cause flooding, are dikes in the waterfront area, flood-control dams upstream from Long Beach, flood control dikes along river courses that pass through Long Beach, and large tanks...the seismically induced flooding potential for Long Beach is primarily from rupture of dikes during an earthquake."

The proposed project is located in Flood Zone X, outside the 100-year flood hazard area. According to Plate 10 of the Seismic Safety Element, the project site is not located within the maximum flood inundation limits for assumed breaches of both the Hansen dam and the Whittier Narrows Dam, according to studies by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1985 and 1986. Furthermore, the Seismic Safety Element states that because these dams impound water only during periods of significant infrequent high, seasonal precipitation, the probability of flooding due to coincident seismically induced dam and retention basin failure is considered very low. Also, these studies found that much of the floodwaters resulting from a dam failure when reservoirs are full would be expected to dissipate before reaching Long Beach. The project site also is not located within a FEMA flood zone identified as a flooding risk due to the failure of a levee or dike. The Seismic Safety Element goes on to state, "The extent of flooding estimated for the 100-year flood exceeds, in most area, that caused by the possible failure of any of the upstream dams. Therefore, the hazards are similar as to the possible extent of flooding but, as stated above, the probability of flooding due to coincident seismically induced failure of a dam is considered to be very low and less probable than the 100-year flood." The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss involving flooding. The project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

j. Would the project result in inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

According to Plate 11 of the Seismic Safety Element, the project site is within the land area susceptible to tsunami run-up. This was confirmed to be current by consulting the Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning prepared by the California Geological Survey (March 1, 2009). The hazard of seiche is limited to harbor and channel areas, and the hazard of mudflow is limited to areas in the

vicinity of significant slopes; neither apply to the project site. The Seismic Safety Element discusses the hazard of tsunami inundation as follows:

“Due to the presence of the Palos Verdes Peninsula, Channel Islands, and the harbor breakwater, the Long Beach coastline and harbor are somewhat protected (especially to the north and west). However, due to the more open exposure to the south, the harbor and coastline are more vulnerable to tsunamis generated in the south seas and offshore southern California. Published estimates of recurrence intervals indicate maximum wave heights of 3 to 6 feet for 50 and 100 year recurrence intervals. Such events are not expected to cause major damage to on-shore features. However, there is considerable potential for damage to boats, harbor facilities, and light, seafront structures during such events. Warning time in terms of perhaps 6 to 12 hours would be expected for distant events. The potential for death or injury from this source is not considered great, although shoreline property damage could be substantial.”

The project site is located outside of the 100-year flood zone identified by FEMA. Also, the Seismic Safety Element’s analysis states that major damage would not be expected to on-shore features (such as the project location) as a result of the maximum expected tsunami run-up of 3 to 6 feet for the project site. Furthermore, the project will not result in a significant change in the land use (it will remain a single-family dwelling), nor will it expose the site to different or heightened tsunami hazards than those experienced by all adjacent and nearby properties in the project vicinity on The Peninsula. As such, the project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

a. Would the project physically divide an established community?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is located on an existing 3,184-sq. ft. developed residential lot. The project will not physically divide an established community, and will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

b. Would the project 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project includes a zone change on a single lot at the subject site, from a commercial mixed-use zoning district (CNR) to a residential two-family zoning district (R-2-I), to match the vast majority of private property zoning on The Peninsula. The existing General Plan Land Use District (LUD) for the site is LUD No. 2—Mixed Style Homes District. The current CNR zoning is not consistent with this LUD, and the zone change to R-2-I will bring it into consistency with LUD No. 2. Therefore, the project will not conflict with the General Plan. LUD No. 2 covers all of The Peninsula neighborhood, with the exception of a strip of LUD No. 7—Mixed Use District, which applies to properties with frontage on the adjacent 62nd Place. LUD No. 2 specifically allows a mixture of low- to medium-density residential zoning, including single-family dwellings, duplexes, and triplexes, as well as accommodating a mixture of these and existing moderately-higher-density nonconforming residential uses that resulted from higher density zoning applications in the past. The proposed zoning, R-2-I, will allow a maximum of two dwelling units on this project site; however, only one is proposed to be built as a result of the project.

The project also will be consistent with the Local Coastal Program (LCP). The project site falls within Area E of the LCP. The implementation plan for Area E generally defers to the General Plan and Zoning Regulations for land use and development standards, with the caveat that any changes to these guiding and regulatory documents that would “affect development” must be approved by the California Coastal Commission. However, the proposed zone change to R-2-I would not substantially change or affect development in Area E—the project would, at most, allow the construction of two dwelling units and no commercial space on the subject lot where, under the CNR zoning district, only one dwelling unit was allowed, with the possibility of commercial space. The zone change will result in a building height limit four feet (4') taller than currently allowed under the CNR zoning district (32 feet instead of 28 feet). This type, form, and intensity of development would be entirely consistent with the existing built environment in Area E and would have no substantial effect upon it. The LCP additionally aims to protect the existing amount of affordable housing within the Coastal Zone, requiring one-for-one replacement of any very low-, low-, and moderate-income housing units removed as the result of a project (see pages II-6 through II-14 of the LCP). However, the LCP goes on to exempt from this requirement any removals for the purpose of construction of one or two new residential units.

No specific plan or other additional land use plan, policy, or regulation applies to the project site. As such, the project would result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

c. Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The proposed project would be developed in a built-out urban environment. No habitat conservation plan or natural communities applies to the project site. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

Historically, the primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach has been oil and natural gas. However, oil and natural gas extraction operations have diminished over the last century as the resource has become depleted. Today, extraction operations continue, but on a reduced scale compared to past levels.

a. Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site does not contain any oil extraction operations, and no mineral resources are known to exist on the site. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

b. Would the project 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 Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is not located in a locally important mineral resource recovery site as detailed on the General plan, the Zoning Map, or any other land use plan, nor would the proposed development impair resource recovery from other sites that are delineated in any general, specific, or land use plan to be of importance in this area. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

XII. NOISE

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Noise level measurements include intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks and outdoor recreation areas are more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses.

The City of Long Beach uses the State Noise/Land Use Compatibility Standards, which suggests a desirable exterior noise exposure at 65 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) for sensitive land uses such as residences. Less sensitive commercial and industrial uses may be compatible with ambient noise levels up to 70 dBA. The City of Long Beach has adopted a Noise Ordinance (Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 8.80) that sets exterior and interior noise standards.

a. Would the project result in 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

Construction activities as a result of the project would involve various types of short-term noise impacts from trucks, equipment, and tools, and other types of equipment. Noise produced by such equipment will vary depending upon the type of equipment required, duration of equipment operations, and maintenance levels. These short-term noise levels could range in decibels from approximately 70 dBA to 90 dBA.

All construction activities must be carried out in compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance (Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 8.80). The project would not alter the Noise Ordinance provisions or be exempt from local noise controls. Per the Municipal Code, construction activities are limited to the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00

PM on weekdays and Federal holidays, and 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM on Saturdays. Construction activity on Sundays is prohibited unless the City's Noise Control Officer approves a special permit. Per Long Beach Municipal Code Chapter 8.80.130, it is unlawful for any person to willfully make or continue, or cause to be made or continued, a loud, unnecessary or unusual noise which disturbs the peace and quiet of any neighborhood or which causes any discomfort or annoyance to any reasonable person of normal sensitiveness residing in the area. Noise levels from the demolition and construction activities that will result from the project are not anticipated to be significantly adverse due to the small scale, limited duration, and daytime hours of all such activities. Construction activities would be consistent with typical single- and two-family residential-scale construction work that is permitted and carried out throughout the City.

After construction is complete, noise from the project site will be consistent with that associated with a typical single-family dwelling. For these reasons, the project will have a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

b. Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. During the demolition phase, removal of the existing building foundation, slab (if any), and footings will most likely be required. This work will likely be carried out using an electric-, pneumatic-, or hydraulic-powered demolition hammer which may generate ground-borne vibration and ground-borne noise. Due to the small scale of the construction activities and the fact that construction hours are limited by the Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.80, LBMC), these noise impacts will not be excessive or significant. Other additional site preparation work may be required, such as soil compacting using a powered ground compactor, which may also generate ground-borne vibration and ground-borne noise. Again, due to the limited scale and scope of construction, these impacts will not be excessive or significant. Ground-borne vibration and ground-borne noise impacts for both demolition and construction will be of the same amount and extent as would be expected for other new single-family dwelling construction projects throughout the City. The project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

c. Would the project create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. The project will not create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. The noise levels will remain those typically expected from a single-family dwelling. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

d. Would the project create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. Demolition and construction of the single-family dwelling will result in temporary construction noise impacts of a limited scope and duration, as discussed in **XII-a** and **b**, and will be consistent with the type and levels of noise associated with single-family dwelling-scale construction activities. All construction operations will be required to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance (Chapter 8.80, LBMC), which regulates the time and manner of construction noise. Apart from construction noise, the project will result in no temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels. The project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public or public-use airport. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The City of Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County and the seventh largest in California. Based on the California Department of Finance estimates 2016, Long Beach has a population of 484,958, which was a 0.7 percent increase from the 2015 population estimate of 481,784. According to the 2010 Census, Long Beach had 176,032 housing units, with a citywide rental vacancy rate of 4.2 percent. This represents a 7.94 percent increase in the number of housing units from the 2000 Census. At the same time, the 2010 Census population count was only a 1.5 percent increase from the 2000 Census population count of 461,522.

a. Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling, and the construction of a new single-family dwelling. At most, under the proposed new zoning, a total of 2 dwelling units could be built on the subject site, as opposed to the single dwelling unit that would be permitted under the current CNR zoning. The project will not result in any extension of roads or other infrastructure, or any new businesses on the project site. The project will not induce any substantial population growth, as it will only replace an existing single-family dwelling with a new single-family dwelling; at the most it could (but is not proposed to) result in a total of two dwelling units on the project site, where there currently is one. The project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of a single-family dwelling and construction of a new single-family dwelling to replace it. It will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

c. Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will not displace any people in a manner necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project will result in the demolition of a single-family dwelling, and the construction of a new single-family dwelling. During demolition and construction, the residents of the single dwelling unit, who are also the property owners and the developer, are expected to be adequately accommodated off-site. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire protection is provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 stations in the City (Stations 1–24, with no Station 23), plus one Beach Operations station and a Fire Headquarters. The Department is divided into bureaus of Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, the Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The Fire Department responds to calls for fire, medical, beach, and waterway emergencies in the City. The nearest fire station to the project site is Station 8, located at 5365 E. 2nd St. in Belmont Shore.

Police protection would be provided by the Long Beach Police Department. The Department is divided into bureaus of Administration, Investigation, and Patrol. The City is divided into three Patrol Divisions: East, West, and North, with reestablishment of the South Patrol Division under consideration.

Public education at the K–12 level within the City of Long Beach is provided by the Long Beach Unified School District, which also serves the City of Signal Hill and a large portion of the City of Lakewood.

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

a. Fire protection?

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|

b. Police protection?

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|

c. Schools?

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|

d. Parks?

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|

e. Other public facilities?

- | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |
|---|---|---|---|

For items a. through e.: The project will result in the demolition of a single-family dwelling and construction of a new single-family dwelling to replace it, on an existing 3,184-sq. ft. lot. The initial condition of the site before the project, and the final condition after the project, will be the same in terms of land use, as it will

remain one single-family dwelling. This will not cause any impacts or create or change any demands for public services or governmental facilities. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

For items **a.** and **b.:** The project will result in the demolition of a single-family dwelling and construction of a new single-family dwelling to replace it. The initial condition of the site before the project, and the final condition after the project, will be the same in terms of land use, as it will remain one single-family dwelling. This will not cause any impacts or create or change any demands for existing neighborhood and regional parks and other recreation facilities. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Since 1980, Long Beach has experienced significant population growth, which is expected to continue into the future. Inevitably, growth will generate additional demand for travel. Without proper planning and necessary transportation improvements, this increase in travel demand could result in gridlock on freeways and streets, and jeopardize the tranquility of residential neighborhoods.

- a. Would the project 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of a single-family dwelling and construction of a new single-family dwelling to replace it. The initial condition of the site before the project, and the final condition after the project, will be the same in terms of land use. It will remain one single-family dwelling, with commensurate trip generation, and as such, the project will not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

- b. Would the project 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of a single-family dwelling and construction of a new single-family dwelling to replace it. The initial condition of the site before the project, and the final condition after the project, will be the same in terms of land use. It will remain one single-family dwelling, with commensurate trip generation, and as such, the project will not conflict with an applicable congestion management program or other standards established for designated roads or highways. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

- c. Would the project 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?**

Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling, and the construction of a new single-family dwelling of comparable scale, and will not affect air traffic patterns. The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, and is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

d. Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site consists of a small residential lot with existing access taken from 61st Place. This segment of 61st Place is 36-ft. wide vehicular right-of-way, approximately 165 ft. long, that intersects Ocean Boulevard on the north, and terminates in a landscaping planter adjoining the beach to the south. Ocean Boulevard is an 80-ft.-wide, four-lane surface street that spans the length of The Peninsula. The project will not change the existing site access, and therefore, will not increase any hazards, and will not involve or create a hazard between incompatible uses and traffic types. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

e. Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site consists of a small residential lot with existing access taken from 61st Place. This segment of 61st Place is 36-ft. wide vehicular right-of-way, approximately 165 ft. long, that intersects Ocean Boulevard on the north, and terminates in a landscaping planter adjoining the beach to the south. Ocean Boulevard is an 80-ft.-wide, four-lane surface street that spans the length of The Peninsula. Emergency access is not an issue at the project site; the project will not change the existing site access, and will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

f. Would the project Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project will result in the demolition of a single-family dwelling and construction of a new single-family dwelling to replace it. The initial condition of the site before the project, and the final condition after the project, will be the same in terms of land use. It will remain one single-family dwelling, with commensurate trip generation, and as such, the project will not conflict with an applicable congestion management program or other standards established for designated roads or highways. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

a. Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

b. Would the project 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

c. Would the project 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

d. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

e. Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

f. Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

g. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

For items **a.** through **g.**: The project will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. The project will be served by the existing sewer, stormwater, and potable water utilities already in place for the neighborhood. The project will not place an undue burden on any utility or service system, and no upgrades or expansions to the systems will be required as a result of the project. The site will be served by the landfill/solid waste disposal provider that serves the existing residence at the site, with no change in the solid waste generation situation at the site. The project will not result in the exceedance of any wastewater treatment requirements, will not require the construction of a new wastewater treatment facility or expansion of an existing facility, and will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities. The project will have sufficient water supplies available from existing sources. The project not will result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves the project

that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitment (i.e., there will be no increased wastewater demand or capacity as a result of the project). The project will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste, including the City's Construction & Demolition Debris Recycling Program ("C&D"), through standard permitting and enforcement practices. Due to its small scale and the continuation of the same effective land use at the site, the project will not result in any impacts on items **a.** through **g.**, and no mitigation is required.

XVIII. 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?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project site is on a single developed residential lot in an urbanized setting. Although the project will involve temporary construction activities, it will not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, will not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, will not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, will not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, will not 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. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

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)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project includes a zone change on an existing 3,184-sq. ft. residential lot. The zoning district will change from CNR, which allows mixed-use commercial and

residential (currently a total of one residential dwelling unit), to R-2-I, which is a residential zone that allows no commercial use, but allows a total of two residential dwelling units. While the zone change could potentially result in the construction of a maximum of two dwellings on the site, only one is proposed, and it will be of such a configuration as to preclude the future construction of a second dwelling unit without burdensome alteration and reconfiguration of the entire site plan. As such, the project will not result in any cumulatively considerable impacts or incremental effects, either alone or viewed in combination with past, current, and potential future projects. The project will not result in any impacts, and no mitigation is required.

c. Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated Less Than Significant Impact No Impact

The project does not have environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects upon human beings, either directly or indirectly. The project includes a zone change, and will result in the demolition of an existing single-family dwelling and garage, and construction of a new single-family dwelling and garage. The construction work will have the typical less-than-significant impacts normally associated with construction of one single-family dwelling. Standard application of the City's rules and regulations for construction activities will prevent any substantial adverse effects upon humans during construction, and following construction, the only activities and resulting effects on the project site will be those typically associated with the occupancy of a single-family dwelling. The project will result in a less than significant impact, and no mitigation is required.

LIST OF PERSONS CONSULTED:

- Craig Chalfant, Planner, City of Long Beach, Dept. of Development Services, Planning Bureau
- Carrie Tai, Current Planning Officer, City of Long Beach, Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau
- Christopher Koontz, Advance Planning Officer, City of Long Beach, Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau
- Tai Vu, Senior Civil Engineer, City of Long Beach, Dept. of Development Services, Building & Safety Bureau

REFERENCES:

California Department of Conservation Los Angeles County Important Farmland Map 2014

California Department of Finance Population Estimates

California Division of Mines and Geology Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone maps
California Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42

California Geological Survey Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines

City of Long Beach General Plan:

- Land Use Element
- Housing Element
- Noise Element
- Scenic Routes Element
- Seismic Safety Element

Clean Water Act, Section 404 (33 U.S.C. 1344)

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM)

Long Beach Municipal Code

- Chapter 8.80 (Noise)
- Title 18 (Buildings and Construction)
- Title 21 (Zoning Regulations)

Los Angeles County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) website, Long Beach Airport Influence Area map

United States Census Bureau American FactFinder website

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Vicinity Map

Attachment B – Site Plan

Attachment C – AB 52 Consultation Letter and Responses

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ND-03-16

Attachment A

Vicinity Map

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Subject Property:
 2 61st Pl
 Application No. 1603-22
 Neg. Dec. No. ND-03-16
 Council District 3
 Zoning Code : CNR

Exhibit A



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ND-03-16

Attachment B

Site Plan


THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

BEACH AREA

SAND

SAND

WOOD BOARDWALK



NEIGHBOR HOUSE

FINISH FLOOR EL. HOUSE = 8.25 FT.

PATIO FS = 8.0 FT.

PLANTER AREA

GARAGE AREA

FINISH FLOOR EL. GARAGE = 7.70 FT.

DRIVEWAY

NEIGHBOR HOUSE

SIDEWALK

PLACE



BENCH MARK:
 B.M. #980 CITY OF LONG BEACH
 EL= 3.163 NGVD 29 DATUM

SITE PLAN

1 / 8" = 1' - 0"

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ND-03-16

Attachment C

AB 52 Consultation Letter and Responses

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



CITY OF LONG BEACH

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

333 West Ocean Blvd., 5th Floor Long Beach, CA 90802 (562) 570-6194 FAX (562) 570-6068

PLANNING BUREAU

September 13, 2016

Mr. Andrew Salas
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation
PO Box 393
Covina, CA 91723

Re: AB 52 Consultation with the Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation
for the 2 61st Place Zone Change Project

Dear Mr. Salas:

The City of Long Beach is conducting its AB 52 consultation process for the 2 61st Place Zone Change Project and Negative Declaration ND-03-16. Please consider this letter and preliminary Project information as the initiation of the California Environmental Quality Act, specifically Public Resources Code 21080.3.1 and Chapter 532 Statutes of 2014 (i.e., AB 52). Please respond within 30 days, pursuant to PRC 21080.3.1(d) if you would like to consult on this Project.

The 2 61st Place Zone Change project is located on a single residential lot, 3,184 square feet in area, located at 2 61st Place in The Peninsula neighborhood of Long Beach. The property is the first lot on the water, fronting on Seaside Walk on the Pacific Ocean side of The Peninsula. The property is currently developed with a two-story single-family dwelling and attached garage. The proposed project would change the site zoning from CNR to R-2-I, which would allow the development of a new three-story single-family dwelling. Most of the private property in The Peninsula neighborhood is zoned R-2-I, and this zone change would match the surrounding zoning. Likewise, the proposed construction would match the surrounding development pattern. The existing single-family dwelling and garage would be demolished, the site would be cleared, and the new three-story single-family dwelling would be constructed in conformance with the development standards of the Zoning Regulations.

Your comments and concerns are important to the City of Long Beach. Please respond to this letter within 30 days if you would like to initiate the consultation process. If you have any questions or concerns with the Project, please contact me at:

Scott Kinsey, Planner IV
Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau
333 West Ocean Blvd., 5th floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

Mr. Andrew Salas
AB 52 Consultation on 2 61st Place Zone Change Project
September 13, 2016
Page 2 of 4

(562) 570-6461
scott.kinsey@longbeach.gov

If you have any question regarding the content of this letter, you may contact me directly. The Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians – Kizh Nation has 30 days upon receipt of this letter to provide your input regarding the 2 61st Place Zone Change Project.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Scott Kinsey". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

Scott Kinsey
Planner IV

Attachments: Site Vicinity Map
 Site Plan







Exhibit A

Subject Property:
2 61st PI
Application No. 1603-22
Neg. Dec. No. ND-03-16
Council District 3
Zoning Code : CNR





SITE PLAN

1 / 8" = 1' - 0"

From: Scott Kinsey
To: ["JohnTommy Rosas"](#)
Subject: RE: City of Long Beach AB 52 Consultation - 2 61st Place Zone Change Project
Date: Thursday, August 11, 2016 4:15:00 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)

Mr. Rosas,

I do not currently have any foundation or excavation plans available. The plans are currently architectural/conceptual only in nature. The construction documents will be prepared after the planning entitlements are approved, if they are approved. The foundations and scope of excavation will be similar in nature to those typically associated with a single-family dwelling.

We do not have a cultural resource report for this project. These are not typically required for construction of a single-family dwelling.

Please let me know if you have any other questions or comments.

Best regards,

Scott Kinsey
Planner IV

Long Beach Development Services | Planning Bureau
T (562) 570-6461 F (562) 570-6068
333 West Ocean Blvd., 5th Fl. | Long Beach, CA 90802
scott.kinsey@longbeach.gov | lbsd.longbeach.gov

From: JohnTommy Rosas [mailto:tattnlaw@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2016 1:46 PM
To: Scott Kinsey <Scott.Kinsey@longbeach.gov>
Subject: Re: City of Long Beach AB 52 Consultation - 2 61st Place Zone Change Project

thanks Scott- I confirm receipt of your AB 52 letter -
I will respond soon -
to comment on ND -which should be a MND -
we need any excavations compliant for our tribal cultural resources protections -
please send any excavation /foundation plans -
and cultural resource reports -
thanks jt

On Tue, Aug 9, 2016 at 1:09 PM, Scott Kinsey <Scott.Kinsey@longbeach.gov> wrote:

Mr. John Rosas
Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation

Re: AB 52 Consultation with the Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation for the 2 61st Place Zone Change Project

Dear Mr. Rosas,

The City of Long Beach is conducting its AB 52 consultation process for the 2 61st Place Zone Change Project and Negative Declaration ND-03-16. Please consider this letter and preliminary Project information as the initiation of the California Environmental Quality Act, specifically Public Resources Code 21080.3.1 and Chapter 532 Statutes of 2014 (i.e., AB 52). Please respond within 30 days, pursuant to PRC 21080.3.1(d) if you would like to consult on this Project.

The 2 61st Place Zone Change project is located on a single residential lot, 3,184 square feet in area, located at 2 61st Place in The Peninsula neighborhood of Long Beach. The property is the first lot on the water, fronting on Seaside Walk on the Pacific Ocean side of The Peninsula. The property is currently developed with a two-story single-family dwelling and attached garage. The proposed project would change the site zoning from CNR to R-2-I, which would allow the development of a new three-story single-family dwelling. Most of the private property in The Peninsula neighborhood is zoned R-2-I, and this zone change would match the surrounding zoning. Likewise, the proposed construction would match the surrounding development pattern. The existing single-family dwelling and garage would be demolished, the site would be cleared, and the new three-story single-family dwelling would be constructed in conformance with the development standards of the Zoning Regulations.

Your comments and concerns are important to the City of Long Beach. Please respond to this letter within 30 days if you would like to initiate the consultation process. If you have any questions or concerns with the Project, please contact me at:

Scott Kinsey, Planner IV
Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau
333 West Ocean Blvd., 5th floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

[\(562\) 570-6461](tel:(562)570-6461)
scott.kinsey@longbeach.gov


If you have any question regarding the content of this letter, you may contact me directly. The Tongva Ancestral Territorial Tribal Nation has 30 days upon receipt of this letter to provide your input regarding the 2 61st Place Zone Change Project.

If you have provided a mailing address to the City of Long Beach, a hardcopy of this letter is in the mail to you as well.

Sincerely,

Scott Kinsey
Planner IV

Long Beach Development Services | Planning Bureau
T (562) 570-6461 F (562) 570-6068
333 West Ocean Blvd., 5th Fl. | Long Beach, CA 90802
scott.kinsey@longbeach.gov | lbsd.longbeach.gov



JOHN TOMMY ROSAS

TRIBAL ADMINISTRATOR

TRIBAL LITIGATOR

[TONGVA ANCESTRAL TERRITORIAL TRIBAL NATION](#)

A TRIBAL SOVEREIGN NATION UNDER UNDRIP

AND AS A CALIFORNIA NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBE / SB18-AB 52-AJR 42

25 U.S. Code § 1679 - Public Law 85-671

August 18, 1958 | [H. R. 2824] 72 Stat. 619

Tribal sovereignty in the United States is the inherent authority of indigenous tribes to govern themselves within and outside the borders and waters of the United States of America.

OFFICIAL TATTN CONFIDENTIAL E-MAIL

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

TATTN / TRIBAL NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY:

This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information, Traditional Knowledge and Traditional Cultural Resource Data, Intellectual Property LEGALLY PROTECTED UNDER WIPO and UNDRIP - attorney-client privileged. Any review, use, disclosure, or distribution by unintended recipients is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the original message.

TRUTH IS OUR VICTORY AND HONOR IS OUR PRIZE >TATTN ©

tongvanation.org

From: [Andy](#)
To: [Scott Kinsey](#)
Cc: [Matt Teutimez.Kizh Gabrieleno](#)
Subject: Re: AB52 consultation response for the 2 61st Place Zone Change project
Date: Monday, August 15, 2016 5:13:41 PM

Thank you Mr. Kinsey

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 15, 2016, at 10:00 AM, Scott Kinsey <Scott.Kinsey@longbeach.gov> wrote:

Thank you for your response. We will be in contact with you as the project moves through the approval process.

Regards,

Scott Kinsey
Planner IV

Long Beach Development Services | Planning Bureau
T (562) 570-6461 F (562) 570-6068
333 West Ocean Blvd., 5th Fl. | Long Beach, CA 90802
scott.kinsey@longbeach.gov | lbs.longbeach.gov

From: Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians [<mailto:gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2016 2:59 PM
To: Scott Kinsey <Scott.Kinsey@longbeach.gov>
Cc: Matt Teutimez.Kizh Gabrieleno <matt.teutimez@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: AB52 consultation response for the 2 61st Place Zone Change project

please see attachment

Sincerely,

Andrew Salas, Chairman
Gabrieleno Band of Mission Indians - Kizh Nation
PO Box 393
Covina, CA 91723
cell: (626)926-4131
email: gabrielenoindians@yahoo.com
website: www.gabrielenoindians.org



GABRIELEÑO BAND OF MISSION INDIANS - KIZH NATION

Historically known as The San Gabriel Band of Mission Indians
recognized by the State of California as the aboriginal tribe of the Los Angeles basin

Scott Kinsley, Planner IV
Department of Development Services, Planning Bureau
333 West Ocean Blvd 5th floor
Long Beach Ca 90802

RE: AB52 consultation response for the 2 61st Place Zone Change project

Dear Scott

August 13 2016

Please find this letter in response to your request for consultation dated August 9 2016. I have reviewed the project site and do have concerns for cultural resources. Your project lies in an area where the Ancestral territories of the Kizh (Kite) Gabrieleño's villages adjoined and overlapped with each other, at least during the Late Prehistoric and Protohistoric Periods. The homeland of the Kizh Gabrieleño was probably the most influential Native American group in aboriginal southern California (Bean and Smith 1978a:538), was centered in the Los Angeles Basin, and reached as far east as the San Bernardino-Riverside area. The homeland of our neighbors the Serranos was primarily the San Bernardino Mountains, including the slopes and lowlands on the north and south flanks. Whatever the linguistic affiliation, Native Americans in and around the project area exhibited similar organization and resource procurement strategies. Villages were based on clan or lineage groups. Their home/ base sites are marked by midden deposits often with bedrock mortars. During their seasonal rounds to exploit plant resources, small groups would migrate within their traditional territory in search of specific plants and animals. Their gathering strategies of ten left behind signs of special use sites, usually grinding slicks on bedrock boulders, at the locations of the resources.

Due to the project location and the high sensitivity of the area location, we would like to request one of our certified Native American Monitor to be on site during any and all ground disturbances (including but not limited to pavement removal, post holing, auguring, boring, grading, excavation and trenching) to protect any cultural resources which may be effected during construction or development. In all cases, when the Native American Heritage Commission states there are "no records of sacred sites in the project area" the NAHC will always refer lead agencies to the respective Native American Tribe because the NAHC is only aware of general information and are not the experts on each California Tribe. Our Elder Committee & Tribal Historians are the experts for our Tribe and are able to provide a more complete history (both written and oral) regarding the location of historic villages, trade routes, cemeteries and sacred/religious sites in the project area. While the property may be located in an area that has been previously developed, numerous examples can be shared to show that there still is a possibility that unknown, yet significant, cultural resources will be encountered during ground disturbance activities. Please note, if they haven't been listed with the NAHC, it doesn't mean that they aren't there. Not everyone reports what they know.

The recent implementation of AB52 dictates that lead agencies consult with Native American Tribes who can prove and document traditional and cultural affiliation with the area of said project in order to protect cultural resources. However our tribe is connected Ancestrally to this project location area, what does Ancestrally or Ancestral mean? The people who were in your family in past times, Of, belonging to, inherited from, or denoting an ancestor or ancestors <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/ancestral>. Our priorities are to avoid and protect without delay or conflicts – to consult with you to avoid unnecessary destruction of cultural and biological resources, but also to protect what resources still exist at the project site for the benefit and education of future generations.

CC: NAHC

With respect,

Andrew Salas, Chairman
cell (626)926-4131

Andrew Salas, Chairman
Albert Perez, treasurer I

Nadine Salas, Vice-Chairman
Martha Gonzalez Lemos, treasurer II

Christina Swindall Martinez, secretary
Richard Gradias, Chairman of the council of Elders

PO Box 393 Covina, CA 91723

www.gabrieleñoindians@yahoo.com

gabrieleñoindians@yahoo.com

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ND-03-16

Attachment D

Public Comments on ND-03-16

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

October 10, 2016

To the Coastal Commission, Mayor Robert Garcia, members of the Long Beach City Council and members of the Long Beach Planning Commission:

RE: Proposed Adoption of Initial Study/Negative Declaration for 2 61st Place, Long Beach, CA

Application no. 1603-22

CEQA number: ND-16-03

The following residents living/owning in the affected area, through comments below and others as may be presented at the hearing on this matter, object to the approval of a negative declaration for the proposed project and object to the approval of zoning changes, issuance of a Local Coastal Development Permit, Local Coastal Program Amendment and any other approvals required by law or regulation for the proposed project located at 2 61st Place, Long Beach ("the proposed project").

This petition addresses the appropriateness of utilizing a negative declaration rather than an Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") since the proposed project's short and long term impacts significantly and negatively impact the environmental quality and should be studied, evaluated and mitigated or feasible alternatives adopted as required by law and regulation.

Specifically, the undersigned, for the reasons stated, disagree with the City Planner's conclusion "that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment..." (Initial Study and Negative Declaration for ND 03-16 ("Initial Study") at p.9 (emphasis in original)). The undersigned maintain that this certification is not based on appropriate scientific authority sufficient to avoid use of an EIR or a Mitigated Negative Declaration and or there is sufficient controverting information to require an EIR for the reasons set forth below and others as may be later presented.

FACTS

The proposed project seeks to demolish the existing two-story single family residence and build a three story single family residence exceeding the current zoning height limit.

The most important consideration is the location. 2 61st Place is the residence immediately adjacent to the boardwalk (Seaside Walk) which fronts the beach on the Peninsula. 61st place is a short street- only 5 residential parcels on either side of the short street which dead ends into a planter box adjoining the boardwalk. Vehicular access to homes on the ocean side of 61st Place is quite limited: the only means of vehicular ingress and egress to the proposed project

and to all the homes south of Ocean Ave is 61st Place from where it intersects Ocean Ave. Street parking is very congested.

Although minimized by the Initial Study (Initial Study at p. 15), there are often significant onshore winds blowing sand and trash from the beach into the neighborhood. 2 61st Place, due to its location, currently breaks these winds and blocks or inhibits the accompanying sand and trash from entering the neighborhood.

Although it is true that, within a short walk from the proposed project, there are 3 or 4 story residential units, the majority of residential units in the area are 1 or 2 stories. The homes just south of the proposed project at 6103 and 6105 Seaside Walk are 1 and 2 stories respectively. The northerly adjacent median planter area is sea level and the home immediately north is one story.

All of the residential units on 61 Place south of Ocean are two stories. The proposed 3 story building is therefore neither consistent with existing neighborhood heights, the character of the neighborhood and the view access of the other homes on 61st Place. Moreover, whatever historical oddities led to the current zoning at the proposed project, there is no need, other than the projected profit of the project applicant/owner, to change the zoning, nor is the proposed project, given its view and other impediments, consistent with the Local Coastal Plan ("LCP").

The following constitute significant impacts that will result from the proposed project. The undersigned demand that these short and long term impacts be fully identified, evaluated, mitigated and feasible alternatives adopted as consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and implementing regulations.

APPLICABLE AUTHORITY

The approval of the proposed project is subject to CEQA, the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA Guidelines"), the LCP, the Coastal Act, and City zoning.

The availability of use of a Negative Declaration in lieu of an EIR is authorized in CEQA Guidelines 15063(b) (2) when there is no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects could result in significant adverse impacts. Under 15064, "if there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project *may have a significant effect on the environment*, the agency *shall* prepare a draft EIR." (emphasis added)

With due deference to the City planning process, the impacts identified below were either not studied, inadequately studied, minimized or otherwise insufficiently evaluated and considered.

An EIR and not a Negative Declaration should be utilized so that the true impacts of the proposed project are known and mitigated as required by law including feasible alternatives.

Spot Zoning: The proposed project clearly violates public policy against spot zoning. Spot zoning is the application of zoning to a specific parcel or parcels of land within a larger zoned area when the rezoning is usually at odds with a city's master plan and current zoning restrictions. Spot zoning may be ruled invalid as an "arbitrary, capricious and unreasonable treatment" of a limited parcel of land by a local zoning ordinance. While zoning regulates the land use in whole districts, spot zoning makes unjustified exceptions for a parcel or parcels within a district.

The small size of the parcel is not the sole defining characteristic of a spot zone. Rather, the defining characteristic is the narrowness and unjustified nature of the benefit to the particular property owner, to the detriment of a general land use plan or public goals. When the change in zoning does not advance a general public purpose in land use, California courts have consistently ruled spot zoning as illegal.

With regard to the proposed project, the requested rezoning provides an unjustified special treatment that benefits a particular owner, while undermining the pre-existing rights and uses of adjacent property owners. To that end, the requested zone change should be denied.

Coastal Act: The Coastal Act aims to ensure maximum access to the coast, beaches and ocean. The proposed development limits such access as described herein and the height proposed may violate the Coastal Act, See Public Access sections at Sections 30210, 30211 and 30212.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Short term effects

1. **Increased wind, sand and trash into the neighborhood.** As noted, 2 61st Place acts as a buffer between the ocean and the homes on 61st Place. The initial study does not describe the impact of wind, sand and trash but on windy days the effects are significant. Demolition of 2 61st Place and the resultant vacant lot for the length of new construction, estimated at one year or longer, will result in significant increases of windblown trash and sand into the neighborhood at 61st Place.
2. **Increased traffic.** The inevitable trucks and construction vehicles have only 61st Place to access the proposed project. The proposed project is at the dead end of 61stPlace. The significant amount of construction-related traffic will significantly and adversely impact the quality of life for the residents on 61st Place.

3. **Decreased parking.** 61st Place parking is already adversely impacted. Other than the driveway access at 2 61st street, there is no street parking. Accordingly, all parking by construction vehicles on the street will necessarily and significantly impact neighborhood parking. Several of the residents are handicapped and/or elderly and are not able to walk to their vehicles beyond 61st Place.
4. **Increased noise, dust and sand.** Because the proposed project seeks to go to 3 stories, significant drilling will be necessary, thereby raising sand and dust and causing severe vibration to the neighboring residents. Given the seabreeze, these will infiltrate the neighborhood, significantly impacting the quality of air, health and life.

Long Term Effects

1. **Elimination or reduction of beach view.** As mentioned above, **none of the residences adjacent to the proposed project and none of the residential units on 61st Place exceed 2 stories.** It is common sense and inescapable fact that building a 3 story building at 2 61st Place will obstruct or limit the views of neighbors who must currently see light or ocean view from decks or second story rooms. No review of this impact is studied by the Initial study and represents a significant impact on neighbors' visual access to the ocean. In addition, this loss of view, light and enjoyment of the coast will result in a severe and uncompensated diminution in value to all of the residents on 61st Place. As mentioned above, no review of this financial impact is studied by the Initial study.


2. **Impact on neighborhood character/aesthetics.** Since none of the adjacent or nearby homes are 3 stories, allowing the first at that level impacts the character of the neighborhood, the skyline and begins a "race to the top" as ocean views demand higher buildings. This would create an irreversible precedent that clearly flies in the face of the Coastal Plan. Not only does this impact the culture or "feel" of the neighborhood, but raising the height impacts the light and sound that characterize this neighborhood. These irrecoverable aspects of 61st Place constitute a significant impact and must, at a minimum, be studied and mitigated.

Dated: October 10, 2016



By Marc Coleman, 6103 Seaside Walk, Long Beach

Additional signatures to be presented during the comment period.



HAND DELIVERED

October 18, 2016

Planning Commission for the
City of Long Beach
333 West Ocean Blvd., 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

**Re: Public Comments/Objections to Proposed
Adoption of Negative Declaration for 2 61st Place, Long Beach, CA
and Related Actions
Application No.: 1603-22
CEQA No. ND-16-03**

TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

The attached petition was filed with only my signature on October 10, 2016 so that it could be included in the Commissioners' package. Attached is the full version containing the signatures of twelve (12) residents including owners and tenants in the affected area. Please ensure that the Commissioners are given a copy of the full petition prior to the hearing on October 20th.

Sincerely,

Marc Coleman
6103 Seaside Walk
Long Beach, California

October 10, 2016

To the Coastal Commission, Mayor Robert Garcia, members of the Long Beach City Council and members of the Long Beach Planning Commission:

RE: Proposed Adoption of Initial Study/Negative Declaration for 2 61st Place, Long Beach, CA

Application no. 1603-22

CEQA number: ND-16-03

The following residents living/owning in the affected area, through comments below and others as may be presented at the hearing on this matter, object to the approval of a negative declaration for the proposed project and object to the approval of zoning changes, issuance of a Local Coastal Development Permit, Local Coastal Program Amendment and any other approvals required by law or regulation for the proposed project located at 2 61st Place, Long Beach (“the proposed project”).

This petition addresses the appropriateness of utilizing a negative declaration rather than an Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) since the proposed project’s short and long term impacts significantly and negatively impact the environmental quality and should be studied, evaluated and mitigated or feasible alternatives adopted as required by law and regulation.

Specifically, the undersigned, for the reasons stated, disagree with the City Planner’s conclusion “that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment...” (Initial Study and Negative Declaration for ND 03-16 (“Initial Study”) at p.9 (emphasis in original)). The undersigned maintain that this certification is not based on appropriate scientific authority sufficient to avoid use of an EIR or a Mitigated Negative Declaration and or there is sufficient controverting information to require an EIR for the reasons set forth below and others as may be later presented.

FACTS

The proposed project seeks to demolish the existing two-story single family residence and build a three story single family residence exceeding the current zoning height limit.

The most important consideration is the location. 2 61st Place is the residence immediately adjacent to the boardwalk (Seaside Walk) which fronts the beach on the Peninsula. 61st place is a short street- only 5 residential parcels on either side of the short street which dead ends into a planter box adjoining the boardwalk. Vehicular access to homes on the ocean side of 61st Place is quite limited: the only means of vehicular ingress and egress to the proposed project

and to all the homes south of Ocean Ave is 61st Place from where it intersects Ocean Ave. Street parking is very congested.

Although minimized by the Initial Study (Initial Study at p. 15), there are often significant onshore winds blowing sand and trash from the beach into the neighborhood. 2 61st Place, due to its location, currently breaks these winds and blocks or inhibits the accompanying sand and trash from entering the neighborhood.

Although it is true that, within a short walk from the proposed project, there are 3 or 4 story residential units, the majority of residential units in the area are 1 or 2 stories. The homes just south of the proposed project at 6103 and 6105 Seaside Walk are 1 and 2 stories respectively. The northerly adjacent median planter area is sea level and the home immediately north is one story.

All of the residential units on 61 Place south of Ocean are two stories. The proposed 3 story building is therefore neither consistent with existing neighborhood heights, the character of the neighborhood and the view access of the other homes on 61st Place. Moreover, whatever historical oddities led to the current zoning at the proposed project, there is no need, other than the projected profit of the project applicant/owner, to change the zoning, nor is the proposed project, given its view and other impediments, consistent with the Local Coastal Plan ("LCP").

The following constitute significant impacts that will result from the proposed project. The undersigned demand that these short and long term impacts be fully identified, evaluated, mitigated and feasible alternatives adopted as consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and implementing regulations.

APPLICABLE AUTHORITY

The approval of the proposed project is subject to CEQA, the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA Guidelines"), the LCP, the Coastal Act, and City zoning.

The availability of use of a Negative Declaration in lieu of an EIR is authorized in CEQA Guidelines 15063(b) (2) when there is no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects could result in significant adverse impacts. Under 15064, "if there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project *may have a significant effect on the environment*, the agency *shall* prepare a draft EIR." (emphasis added)

With due deference to the City planning process, the impacts identified below were either not studied, inadequately studied, minimized or otherwise insufficiently evaluated and considered.

An EIR and not a Negative Declaration should be utilized so that the true impacts of the proposed project are known and mitigated as required by law including feasible alternatives.

Spot Zoning: The proposed project clearly violates public policy against spot zoning. Spot zoning is the application of zoning to a specific parcel or parcels of land within a larger zoned area when the rezoning is usually at odds with a city's master plan and current zoning restrictions. Spot zoning may be ruled invalid as an "arbitrary, capricious and unreasonable treatment" of a limited parcel of land by a local zoning ordinance. While zoning regulates the land use in whole districts, spot zoning makes unjustified exceptions for a parcel or parcels within a district.

The small size of the parcel is not the sole defining characteristic of a spot zone. Rather, the defining characteristic is the narrowness and unjustified nature of the benefit to the particular property owner, to the detriment of a general land use plan or public goals. When the change in zoning does not advance a general public purpose in land use, California courts have consistently ruled spot zoning as illegal.

With regard to the proposed project, the requested rezoning provides an unjustified special treatment that benefits a particular owner, while undermining the pre-existing rights and uses of adjacent property owners. To that end, the requested zone change should be denied.

Coastal Act: The Coastal Act aims to ensure maximum access to the coast, beaches and ocean. The proposed development limits such access as described herein and the height proposed may violate the Coastal Act, See Public Access sections at Sections 30210, 30211 and 30212.

SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

Short term effects

1. **Increased wind, sand and trash into the neighborhood.** As noted, 2 61st Place acts as a buffer between the ocean and the homes on 61st Place. The initial study does not describe the impact of wind, sand and trash but on windy days the effects are significant. Demolition of 2 61st Place and the resultant vacant lot for the length of new construction, estimated at one year or longer, will result in significant increases of windblown trash and sand into the neighborhood at 61st Place.
2. **Increased traffic.** The inevitable trucks and construction vehicles have only 61st Place to access the proposed project. The proposed project is at the dead end of 61st Place. The significant amount of construction-related traffic will significantly and adversely impact the quality of life for the residents on 61st Place.


3. **Decreased parking.** 61st Place parking is already adversely impacted. Other than the driveway access at 2 61st street, there is no street parking. Accordingly, all parking by construction vehicles on the street will necessarily and significantly impact neighborhood parking. Several of the residents are handicapped and/or elderly and are not able to walk to their vehicles beyond 61st Place.
4. **Increased noise, dust and sand.** Because the proposed project seeks to go to 3 stories, significant drilling will be necessary, thereby raising sand and dust and causing severe vibration to the neighboring residents. Given the seabreeze, these will infiltrate the neighborhood, significantly impacting the quality of air, health and life.

Long Term Effects

1. **Elimination or reduction of beach view.** As mentioned above, **none of the residences adjacent to the proposed project and none of the residential units on 61st Place exceed 2 stories.** It is common sense and inescapable fact that building a 3 story building at 2 61st Place will obstruct or limit the views of neighbors who must currently see light or ocean view from decks or second story rooms. No review of this impact is studied by the Initial study and represents a significant impact on neighbors' visual access to the ocean. In addition, this loss of view, light and enjoyment of the coast will result in a severe and uncompensated diminution in value to all of the residents on 61st Place. As mentioned above, no review of this financial impact is studied by the Initial study.


2. **Impact on neighborhood character/aesthetics.** Since none of the adjacent or nearby homes are 3 stories, allowing the first at that level impacts the character of the neighborhood, the skyline and begins a "race to the top" as ocean views demand higher buildings. This would create an irreversible precedent that clearly flies in the face of the Coastal Plan. Not only does this impact the culture or "feel" of the neighborhood, but raising the height impacts the light and sound that characterize this neighborhood. These irrecoverable aspects of 61st Place constitute a significant impact and must, at a minimum, be studied and mitigated.

Dated: October 10, 2016



By Marc Coleman, 6103 Seaside Walk, Long Beach

Additional signatures to be presented during the comment period.



Name


JOSEPH L. FERES

Address

18 61ST PL.

10-11-16

Signature



Date

Name

Diane Christie Feres

Address

18 61ST Place LB

10/11/16

Signature



Date

Name

Katherine Vance

Address

1 62nd Pl #103

10/13/16

Signature

Km Vance

Date

Name

Patricia Donnen

10-16-16

Address

263 61st Pl #A

10-16-16

Signature

Marie Gargano

Date

Name

26 61st Pl Apt D LB 11803

Address

[Signature]

10/16/16

Signature

Date

Name

D. O'Connell

Address

6100 E. OCEAN

10/16/16

Signature

[Signature]

Date

Name

Ernest E Suwaga

Address

6105 E Seaside Walk

10/18/16

Signature



Date

Name


PAULA J. WULFF

Address

6105 E. Seaside WALK

10/18/16

Signature



Date

Name

Address

Signature

Date

Name

Address

Signature

Date

2. Impact on neighborhood character/aesthetics. Since none of the adjacent or nearby homes are 3 stories, allowing the first at that level impacts the character of the neighborhood, the skyline and begins a "race to the top" as ocean views demand higher buildings. This would create an irreversible precedent that clearly flies in the face of the Coastal Plan. Not only does this impact the culture or "feel" of the neighborhood, but raising the height impacts the light and sound that characterize this neighborhood. These irrecoverable aspects of 61st Place constitute a significant impact and must, at a minimum, be studied and mitigated.

Dated: October 10, 2016

By Marc Coleman, 6103 Seaside Walk, Long Beach

Additional signatures to be presented during the comment period.

Christopher K. Cooper

Name

14 61st Place, Long Beach, CA 90803

Address

Christopher K. Cooper

10-11-16

Signature

Date

Christina H. Cooper

Name

14 61st Place Long Beach, CA 90803

Address

Christina H. Cooper

10.12.16

Signature

Date

Name

Joseph Buck Hudson

Address

17-67⁵ Al Long Beach, CA 10/16/16

Signature

Joseph Buck Hudson

10823

Date

Name

Address

Signature

Date

Name

Address

Signature

Date

Name

Address

Signature

Date
