



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT A

RESOLUTION NO. _____

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * * * *

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE INITIAL STUDY AND MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE AMENDMENT OF THE COUNTY GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF APN 069-341-050 AT 206 SEQUOIA AVENUE FROM “MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL” TO “HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL” AND REZONING THE SUBJECT PARCEL FROM R-1/S-74 TO R-3/S-3

RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo, State of California, that

WHEREAS, on October 14, 2020, the landowner, Canyon Vista Partners, LLC, at 206 Sequoia Avenue (APN 069-341-050), in the unincorporated Sequoia Tract area of San Mateo County, submitted an application to rezone the subject parcel from “One-family Residential” (R-1) to “Multiple-family Residential” (R-3) and to change the County General Plan Land Use designation from “Medium Density Residential” to “High Density Residential”; and

WHEREAS, approval of the applicant’s proposal is considered a “Project” as that term is defined under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”); and

WHEREAS, the County prepared an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for this project, consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, and determined that the proposed zoning map and General Plan land use map amendments could not have a significant effect on the environment

because all potential impacts of the project could be mitigated to levels below established CEQA thresholds of significance with the adoption of mitigation measures and enforcement of such measures through a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”); and

WHEREAS, the Initial Study and Negative Declaration was posted on January 7, 2021, and noticed and circulated for comment in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, the County Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing on February 24, 2021, and received public comment, and has recommended that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration as complete, correct and adequate, and prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and applicable State and County guidelines; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors held a duly noticed public hearing on May 18, 2021, to consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the proposed amendments and to take public testimony; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors, in its independent judgement and analysis, has considered the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, along with comments received, and finds on the basis of the whole record before it that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DETERMINED AND ORDERED that:

1. The Board of Supervisors adopts the attached Mitigated Negative Declaration as complete, correct and adequate, and prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act and applicable State and County guidelines; and

2. The Board of Supervisors adopts the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.

* * * * *



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT B

RESOLUTION NO. _____

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * * * *

RESOLUTION AMENDING THE SAN MATEO COUNTY GENERAL PLAN LAND USE MAP TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DESIGNATION OF APN 069-341-050 AT 206 SEQUOIA AVENUE FROM “MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL” TO “HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL”

RESOLVED, by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo, State of California, that

WHEREAS, on October 14, 2020, the landowner, Canyon Vista Partners, LLC, at 206 Sequoia Avenue (APN 069-341-050), in the unincorporated Sequoia Tract area of San Mateo County, submitted an application to rezone the subject parcel from “One-family Residential” (R-1) to “Multiple-family Residential” (R-3) and to change the County General Plan Land Use Designation from “Medium Density Residential” to “High Density Residential”; and

WHEREAS, the County has prepared, and the Board of Supervisors has adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and the CEQA Guidelines, which analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed rezoning and General Plan amendment; and

WHEREAS, on February 24, 2021, the County Planning Commission at its duly noticed public hearing considered the amendment described above and recommended approval of the amendment; and

WHEREAS, on May 18, 2021, the Board of Supervisors at its duly noticed public hearing considered the proposed amendment and finds that the General Plan Land Use Map Amendment is consistent with the applicable General Plan policies, and is compatible with adjacent land uses and will not be in conflict with the policies of the General Plan as the project parcel abuts commercial, multi-family and single-family residential developments and re-designation of the parcel from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential will allow better utilization of the property as a transitional buffer between the higher intensity commercial corridor along Woodside Road and the lower density single-family residential area of the Sequoia Tract, while maintaining a consistent land use pattern in the area and supporting Housing Element policies for the creation of new housing opportunities within the County.

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY DETERMINED AND ORDERED that the Board of Supervisors amends the San Mateo County General Plan Land Use Map to change the land use designation of one parcel located at 206 Sequoia Avenue (APN 069-341-050) in the unincorporated Sequoia Tract area of San Mateo County from “Medium Density Residential” to “High Density Residential”.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage and adoption.



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT C

ORDINANCE NO. _____
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO,
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

* * * * *

**ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 2 OF DIVISION VI OF THE SAN MATEO
COUNTY ORDINANCE CODE (ZONING ANNEX) TO REVISE THE ZONING MAPS,
APPENDIX A, TO CHANGE THE ZONING OF APN 069-341-050 AT 206 SEQUOIA
AVENUE FROM R-1/S-74 TO R-3/S-3**

The Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo, State of California,

ORDAINS as follows

SECTION 1. Findings. The Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo

("County") hereby finds and declares as follows:

WHEREAS, on October 14, 2020, the landowner, Canyon Vista Partners, LLC, at 206 Sequoia Avenue (APN 069-341-050), in the unincorporated Sequoia Tract area of San Mateo County, submitted an application to rezone the subject parcel from "One-family Residential" (R-1) to "Multiple-family Residential" (R-3) and to change the County General Plan Land Use designation from "Medium Density Residential" to "High Density Residential"; and

WHEREAS, the County has prepared, and the Board of Supervisors has adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") and the CEQA Guidelines, which analyzes the potential impacts of the proposed rezoning and General Plan amendment; and

WHEREAS, on February 24, 2021, the County Planning Commission at its duly noticed public hearing considered the proposal described above and recommended approval of the zoning amendment; and

WHEREAS, on May 18, 2021, the Board of Supervisors at its duly noticed public hearing considered the proposed zoning amendment; and

WHEREAS, the Board finds that the proposed rezoning of the subject parcel meets the public necessity, convenience, and the general welfare of the community as the existing one-family residentially zoned project parcel is comparably larger in size than surrounding parcels with the same zoning, and the rezoning will be compatible with the type and density of other multi-family residential development in the area and provides an opportunity for additional housing units in a highly urbanized area that already has the supporting infrastructure.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Mateo, State of California, ordains as follows:

SECTION 2. Section 6115 of Chapter 2 of Part One of Division VI of the San Mateo County Ordinance Code (Zoning Maps), Appendix A, shall be amended to change the zoning designation of one parcel located at 206 Sequoia Avenue (Assessor's Parcel Number 069-341-050) from R-1/S-74 to R-3/S-3.

SECTION 3. The Clerk shall publish this ordinance in accordance with applicable law.


SECTION 4. This Ordinance shall be effective thirty (30) days from the passage date thereof.

* * * * *



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT D



0.07 0 0.04 0.07 Miles

WGS_1984_Web_Mercator_Auxiliary_Sphere
© Latitude Geographics Group Ltd.

1:2,257 



This map is a user generated static output from an Internet mapping site and is for reference only. Data layers that appear on this map may or may not be accurate, current, or otherwise reliable.

THIS MAP IS NOT TO BE USED FOR NAVIGATION



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT


ATTACHMENT E





COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT


ATTACHMENT F





COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT G



LEGEND

- | | |
|------------|---------------------------|
| AC PAVE | PROPERTY LINE |
| CB | ASPHALT CONCRETE PAVEMENT |
| COL | CATCH BASIN |
| CONC | COLUMN |
| EM | ELECTRIC METER |
| EP | EDGE OF PAVEMENT |
| FF | FINISH FLOOR |
| FL | FLOWLINE |
| GA | GUY ANCHOR |
| GS FF | GARAGE SLAB FINISH FLOOR |
| INV | INVERT |
| JU | JOINT UTILITY POLE |
| MB | MAILBOX |
| SDMH | STORM DRAIN MANHOLE |
| SSMH | SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE |
| TC | TOP OF CURB |
| TCO | THRU CURB DRAIN |
| TD | TOP OF GRATE |
| WM | WATER METER |
| ○ 12" TREE | TREE W/ SIZE |
| -X-X- | FENCE |
| OH | OVERHEAD UTILITY LINE |
| SS | SANITARY SEWER LINE |
| SD | STORM DRAIN LINE |
| W | WATER LINE |

LOT AREA:

- = 18,951 SQ. FT. ±
- = 0.435 ACRES ±

UTILITY NOTE:

THE UTILITIES EXISTING ON THE SURFACE AND SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING HAVE BEEN LOCATED BY FIELD SURVEY. ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN ON THIS DRAWING ARE FROM RECORDS OF THE VARIOUS UTILITY COMPANIES AND THE SURVEYOR/ENGINEER DOES NOT ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR COMPLETENESS, INDICATED LOCATION, OR SIZE. RECORD UTILITY LOCATION SHOULD BE CONFIRMED BY EXPOSING THE UTILITY.

REV	DESCRIPTION	BY	DATE




MACLEOD AND ASSOCIATES
 CIVIL ENGINEERING - LAND SURVEYING
 965 CENTER STREET - SAN CARLOS, CA 94070 - (650) 563-8590

PREPARED FOR:
 GROVE CONSTRUCTION

TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY PLAN
 206 SECODIA AVENUE
 A.P.N. 089-341-050
 LOT 12, BLOCK A, 10 MAPS 13
 UNINCORPORATED SAN MATEO COUNTY CALIFORNIA

DRAWN BY: MEL
 DESIGNED BY: ---
 CHECKED BY: DOM
 SCALE: 1"=10'
 DATE: 02/21/20
 DRAWING NO. 4725-TOPO
 SHEET 1 OF 1





COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT H

September 21, 2020

Ron Grove
Canyon Vista Partners LLC
206 Sequoia Avenue
Redwood City, CA 94061

Dear Mr. Grove:

SUBJECT: Summary of County Comments and Comments/Questions Received at a Major Development Pre-Application Public Workshop on August 17, 2020
County File Number: PRE 2020-00006

Thank you for your participation in the virtual public workshop held on August 17, 2020 via Zoom, regarding the General Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment of one parcel (APNs 069-341-050) located at 206 Sequoia Avenue in the unincorporated Sequoia Tract of San Mateo County. The subject parcel, currently zoned R-1/S-74 (One-Family Residential; S-74 Combining District), is proposed to be re-zoned to R-3/S-3 (Multiple-Family Residential; 5,000 square foot minimum parcel size) to allow for higher density housing. The General Plan Land Use Designation would change from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential. Such a proposal could yield approximately 15 units with at least 3 affordable dwelling units.

The information and comments exchanged are invaluable in fostering an understanding of the surrounding community's concerns and comments about the project. The purpose of this letter is to summarize the comments received at the workshop and include comments from the County Planning, other reviewing departments and additional comments from interested parties.

Besides the applicant, there were about 20 members of the public in attendance at the meeting. Prior to the meeting, staff received 12 emails from interested neighbors expressing concern about the project, particularly about noticing requirements, impacts of upzoning, and effects on neighborhood character.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC CONCERNS REGARDING THE PROJECT

Generally, interested members of the public in attendance at the meeting expressed concerns regarding the proposed re-zoning. There was a strong sentiment that the project



would negatively impact the community and neighborhood as supported by the comments listed below:

1. **Noticing:** General concern was noted both via email and at the workshop that not all residents living within 300 feet of the subject parcel were notified of the workshop.

Staff Input: As required by Section 6415.4 of the County Zoning Regulations, notice was provided for “all property owners within five hundred (500) feet of the project site boundary.” If the property owner does not reside at the residence, for instance the home is a rental property, the non-owner resident would not have received the workshop notice. Future correspondence regarding this project will be forwarded to those interested members of the public who have provided County staff with their contact information.

2. **Single-Family Homes and Duplexes:** A member of the public suggested that the property owner of the subject parcel should purchase the adjacent flag lot at 214 Sequoia Avenue to create a development of single-family homes and duplexes through a re-zone to a PUD (Planned Unit Development). They believed this type of development would achieve a better transition from Woodside Road to the predominantly single-family residential community. Another member of the public commented that large lots in Sequoia Tract have been subdivided into separate lots to be individually developed with single family homes.

Staff Input: To create a development of single-family homes and duplexes on both the subject property and the adjacent property at 214 Sequoia Avenue, the applicant would likely need to apply for a re-zoning to a PUD from the County. This would be necessary to create lots which are less than 5,000 sq. ft. in size as required by the existing zoning. Regarding the subdivision of the lot to create single-family homes, each lot in the R-1/S-74 Zoning District must be a minimum of 5,000 sq. ft. and have a minimum width of 50 feet. The subject parcel could likely be subdivided into three lots with a design exception for lot depth. This would yield a maximum of six (6) dwelling units, three (3) single-family residences and three (3) accessory dwelling units (ADU). The ADUs could not be sold separately.

3. **Zoning and Property Rights:** Comments were raised that the proposed rezoning is not in compliance with the intent of the S-74 Zoning Regulations which were specifically passed to reduce the size and bulk of the structures in Sequoia Tract. It was suggested by a resident that the rezoning to R-1/S-74 constituted a promise by the County that the zoning could not be changed to allow for denser development. In that vein, many comments were also received regarding concerns of spot zoning and how far multi-family zoning should extend from Woodside Road.

Staff Input: When examining the zoning in the unincorporated Sequoia Tract area, the proposed rezoning of the subject parcel would be consistent with the general multi-family zoning concentrated on and near Woodside Road. As demonstrated at the meeting, Sequoia Tract has not been subject to spot zoning within the middle of the

R-1/S-74 area. The subject parcel is adjacent to multi-family and commercial zoning districts. In addition, the subject property is within walking distance to bus stops, Woodside Plaza and various commercial establishments on Woodside Road. Proposals for denser development are preferred in proximity to such areas and services, reducing the need for vehicular trips and providing much needed housing to address the housing crisis.

While the County's General Plan (Policies 8.1, 8.3, 8.15, and 8.31) and Housing Element (Policies HE 17 and HE 44) generally encourage the exploration of opportunities for multi-family residential development in urban neighborhoods and along major corridors such as Woodside Road, rezonings are a discretionary act subject to public comment, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review, Planning Commission recommendation, and Board of Supervisors approval.

4. **Upzoning and the Impacts of Living with Pandemics:** Comments questioned the need for higher density development considering the effects of COVID-19. A member of the public suggested that pandemic-like events should encourage less dense development. A comment was raised, claiming that, because people are moving away from the area and working remotely due to COVID-19, that more housing may no longer be needed for the state.

Staff Input: Like most counties and cities in California, San Mateo County is extremely deficient in the amounts of market rate and affordable housing available. Such development proposals with higher densities would assist in the reduction of the overall housing shortage.

5. **Parking:** Comments suggested that the proposed project would exacerbate parking problems that the neighborhood is already experiencing. Comments indicated that each housing unit may have multiple cars associated with it and would result in extra parked cars on Sequoia Avenue. A nearby resident requested a parking survey to assess issues at Sequoia Avenue and Woodside Road.

Staff Input: At the time development plans are submitted as part of a development application, the proposed on-site parking spaces must comply with the number of parking spaces required for the proposed development pursuant to Section 6119 of the County Zoning Regulations. A development application cannot be submitted until the approval of the proposed re-zoning. Additionally, as part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process, Planning Staff will consider traffic and parking impacts of the project and require mitigation measures for significant impacts, if any. Staff has determined that an environmental evaluation of any project here will be prepared consistent with CEQA requirements. Traffic, parking, and other potential environmental impacts will be identified, and a public review period will be provided prior to any Planning Commission public hearing.

6. **Neighborhood Character:** A member of the public suggested that a three-story complex will not fit in with the surrounding single-family detached residential

neighborhood, noting concerns about the height and shadows that the building would cast upon adjacent properties.

Staff Input: If the zoning were to be changed to R-3/S-3, the structure would be required to have 20-foot setbacks in the front and rear and 5-foot setbacks on the sides. The maximum height would be 36 feet and lot coverage would be limited to 50 percent. There are multiple R-3 zoned areas along or in proximity to Woodside Road that back up to single-family residential zoned areas, including Nimitz Avenue, Alexander Avenue, Rutherford Avenue, Santiago Avenue, and Sequoia Avenue (subject street).

7. **Traffic and Hazards:** Comments suggested that the proposed project will generate additional traffic from the occupants of the proposed multi-family structure and create new safety hazards.

Staff Input: If the rezoning is approved and an application for development is submitted, any significant environmental impacts that may be caused by this project, including potential traffic impacts, or the creation of new traffic hazards, will be included in the environmental analysis of the project. If necessary, mitigation measures will be proposed to address such issues.

WRITTEN COMMENTS

In summary, prior to and after the meeting, Planning Staff received a total of fifteen (16) written comments from the public in opposition. The comment was generally similar to those received during the meeting.

COMMENTS FROM OTHER REVIEWING AGENCIES

To date, Planning Staff has received preliminary comments from the following agencies:

County Current Planning Section

1. The proposed zoning, R-3/S-3, and General Plan Land Use designation, High Density Residential, would potentially allow for a 15-unit multi-family residential complex, notwithstanding an affordable housing density bonus.
2. Should the applicant move forward with an application for the project as proposed, the required application would include a General Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment.
3. The future development's compliance with the Zoning Regulations will be reviewed when project plans are submitted with an application for a Major Subdivision. A Major Subdivision application can be filed if the General Plan Amendment and Zoning Amendment are approved.
4. Should the applicant move forward with an application for the project as proposed, the application and all supporting documents and materials would be subject to review and

approval by several departments, companies and agencies, including but not limited to: County Department of Public Works, California Water Service, Fair Oaks Sewer District, and Menlo Park Fire Protection District. Agencies may request additional information if needed.

5. Any multi-family development proposal with greater than 5 units must include at least 20 percent affordable units as defined and required in the County's Inclusionary Affordable Housing Ordinance, Sec. 7908 et seq.

Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District (Sewer District)

6. The Planning case application indicates that the property will be subdivided into fifteen (15) condominium units. The Sewer District records indicate that the property has one existing sewer connection. The Sewer District will allow the proposed additional fourteen (14) connections provided that all associated fees are paid. The Sewer District will require the applicant to purchase the additional sewer connections and obtain all appropriate permits for the installation of the connections. The fees for new sewer connections will be calculated based on the plans submitted prior to final approval of the building plans.

The subdivided parcel must connect to the Sewer District main with an individual 6-inch sewer lateral.

7. Detailed plans showing the proposed sewer connections shall be submitted to Sewer District for review prior to final approval of the building plans. The plans shall indicate the location of the existing and proposed sewer laterals.
8. A Sewer Inspection Permit must be obtained to cap the existing sewer lateral prior to demolition of the existing building. A Sewer Inspection Permit may be obtained from the Sewer District office at 555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City.
9. The applicant shall pay a plan review fee in the amount of \$300. Payment shall be made to the County of San Mateo.
10. The applicant shall mitigate the additional sewage to be generated by the site's change in use with a sanitary sewer slip lining or pipe bursting project within the Sewer District to reduce the amount of inflow and infiltration (I/I) in its collection system. This type of mitigation would be considered for offsetting the project's effect on downstream Sewer District and City of Redwood City pipes by reducing or eliminating wet weather inflow and infiltration from the Sewer District that would otherwise be conveyed to the downstream agencies' sewer systems. The applicant would be responsible for the cost of designing, constructing, and managing such improvement project.

California Water Service

11. Any improvements to the water system will be at the owner(s) expense including additional services or fire protection.
12. All storm and sewer lines must have separation from water of 10-foot horizontal separation and 1-foot vertical separation below the water main or service line.
13. Service lines which go through one property to another property must have legal easements granted with documentation submitted to Cal Water before installation.

The formal application, including all plans and materials cited earlier in this letter, should consider the comments discussed above. If you have any questions regarding this summary or need assistance with application requirements, please feel free to contact me at 650/363-4582 or by email at: rpanglao@smcgov.org. If you would like to reach him during the ongoing COVID-19 outbreak, please do so via email as County staff is currently working remotely per County directive until further notice.

Sincerely,



Ruemel Panglao, Project Planner

RSP:cmc – RSPEE0368_WCN.DOCX

cc: Board of Supervisors
Planning Commission
Steve Monowitz, Community Development Director
Lisa Aozasa, Deputy Director
Joe LaClair, Planning Services Manager
Planning Director, City of Redwood City
Menlo Park Fire Protection District
California Water Service – Bear Gulch
County Department of Public Works
Property Owners within a 500-foot Radius of the Proposed Project

Interested Members of the Public

Julie Saiki

Patricia Cooley-Wetzel

Paritosh Ambekar

Merlin Larson

Harry Vold

Rebecca Smith

Carl T

Maggie Heilman

Boris Slutsky

Cynthia Gomez

Janie Mercado

Victoria Knapp

Barbara Cage

Rob Commins

Chris Kellems

Richard Elliot

Boris Grinberg



COUNTY OF SAN MATEO - PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

ATTACHMENT I

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO, PLANNING AND BUILDING DEPARTMENT

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21,000, et seq.), that the following project: General Plan Amendment and Rezone, when adopted and implemented, will not have a significant impact on the environment.

FILE NO.: PLN2020-00351

OWNER: Canyon Vista Partners, LLC

APPLICANT: Canyon Vista Partners, LLC (c/o Ron Grove)

ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NO.: 069-341-050

LOCATION: 206 Sequoia Avenue, unincorporated Redwood City (Sequoia Tract)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project proposes to rezone an existing 18,951 sq. ft. parcel from single-family residential (R-1/S-74) to multi-family residential (R-3/S-3) zoning and amend the General Plan designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential. The project does not include a development proposal.

While no development is proposed at this time, the proposed rezone and General Plan Amendment would allow a future proposal of up to a maximum of 15 residential units on the property. Any future development proposal would be subject to County review at the time of proposal, including environmental review, as applicable, for compliance with CEQA.

FINDINGS AND BASIS FOR A NEGATIVE DECLARATION

The Current Planning Section has reviewed the initial study for the project and, based upon substantial evidence in the record, finds that:

1. The project will not adversely affect water or air quality or increase noise levels substantially.
2. The project will not have adverse impacts on the flora or fauna of the area.
3. The project will not degrade the aesthetic quality of the area.
4. The project will not have adverse impacts on traffic or land use.
5. In addition, the project will not:
 - a. Create impacts which have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment.

- b. Create impacts which achieve short-term to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- c. Create impacts for a project which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- d. Create environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

The County of San Mateo has, therefore, determined that the environmental impact of the project is insignificant.

MITIGATION MEASURES included in the project to avoid potentially significant effects:

Mitigation Measure 1: The applicant shall be responsible for the cost of designing, constructing, and managing a sanitary sewer project within the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District boundary to reduce the amount of inflow and infiltration in its collection system and to offset additional flows generated from any future development of the project parcel. The design of the sanitary sewer project must be completed and approved by the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District prior to the issuance of a building permit on the project property.

RESPONSIBLE AGENCY CONSULTATION

None

INITIAL STUDY

The San Mateo County Current Planning Section has reviewed the Environmental Evaluation of this project and has found that the probable environmental impacts are insignificant. A copy of the initial study is attached, or available on the Department's CEQA Documents website at: <https://planning.smcgov.org/ceqa-docs>.

REVIEW PERIOD: January 7, 2021 to January 27, 2021

All comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of this Mitigated Negative Declaration must be received (mail, fax, or email) by the County Planning and Building Department, 455 County Center, Second Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063, Fax: 650/363-4849, or sburlison@smcgov.org no later than **5:00 p.m., January 27, 2021**. Please be aware that the Planning and Building Department office is temporarily closed due to COVID-19.

CONTACT PERSON

Summer Burlison
Project Planner, 650/363-1815
sburlison@smcgov.org



Summer Burlison, Project Planner

County of San Mateo
Planning and Building Department

**INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST**
(To Be Completed by Planning Department)

1. **Project Title:** General Plan Amendment and Rezone
2. **County File Number:** PLN2020-00351
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of San Mateo, 455 County Center, 2nd Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063
4. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Summer Burlison, Project Planner; 650/363-1815; sburlison@smcgov.org
5. **Project Location:** 206 Sequoia Avenue, unincorporated Redwood City (Sequoia Tract)
6. **Assessor's Parcel Number and Size of Parcel:** 069-341-050; 18,951 sq. ft.
7. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Canyon Vista Partners, LLC, 865 Sweeney Avenue, Redwood City, CA 94063
8. **Name of Person Undertaking the Project or Receiving the Project Approval (if different from Project Sponsor):** N/A
9. **General Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential
10. **Zoning:** R-1/S-74 (Single-family Residential/Sequoia Tract)
11. **Description of the Project:** The project proposes to rezone an existing 18,951 sq. ft. parcel from single-family residential (R-1/S-74) to multi-family residential (R-3/S-3) zoning and amend the General Plan designation from Medium Density Residential to High Density Residential. The project does not include a development proposal.

While no development is proposed at this time, the proposed rezone and General Plan Amendment would allow a future proposal of up to a maximum of 15 residential units on the property. Any future development proposal would be subject to County review at the time of proposal, including environmental review, as applicable, for compliance with CEQA.

12. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The project site is located in the densely urbanized Sequoia Tract community and is accessed directly from Sequoia Avenue, an improved public roadway approximately 300 feet south of its intersection with Woodside Road (Highway 84). The property is located approximately 1.5 miles east of Interstate 280 and 1.5 miles west of the intersection of El Camino Real (Highway 82) and Woodside Road (Highway 84). The property is bordered by a commercial and multi-family residential development to the north, and single-family residential development to the west, south and east (across Sequoia Avenue). The project parcel is currently developed with a single-family residence built in 1978.

13. **Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required:** None
14. **Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?:** No California Native American tribes have requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1.

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” or “Significant Unless Mitigated” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites. 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 Environmental Impact Report (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 Analyses," as described in 5. below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (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 effects 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 which 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. Sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

1. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
1.a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in a scenic vista area. The area in and around the parcel is highly urbanized and developed with varying levels of density and intensity. Furthermore, the project does not propose any development. Given the site and surrounding setting, future redevelopment of the property would not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista, views from existing residential areas, public lands, water bodies, or roads.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Project proposal.</p>				

1.b. Substantially damage or destroy scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located within a state scenic highway. In addition, there are no buildings of historical significance or rock outcroppings located on the property.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Project proposal.</p>				
1.c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings, such as significant change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?				X
<p>Discussion: The project involves a rezone and general plan amendment from single-family residential zoning and medium density land use designation to multi-family residential zoning and high density residential land use designation. Given the highly urbanized area and surrounding development densities, there are no scenic qualities of unique or special interest that would be impacted by the rezone and general plan amendment, or future redevelopment of the property.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Project proposal.</p>				
1.d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will not introduce any new sources of light or glare as no development is proposed. Given the urbanized nature of the surrounding area, any future redevelopment of the project parcel is not expected to create a new source of substantial light and/or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Project proposal.</p>				
1.e. Be adjacent to a designated Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located adjacent to a Scenic Highway or within a State or County Scenic Corridor.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>				

1.f.	If within a Design Review District, conflict with applicable General Plan or Zoning Ordinance provisions?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located within a Design Review District.</p> <p>Source: Project location; San Mateo County Zoning Map.</p>					
1.g.	Visually intrude into an area having natural scenic qualities?				X
<p>Discussion: Refer to staff's discussion in Section 1.a, 1.b, and 1.c, above.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Project proposal.</p>					

<p>2. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
2.a.	For lands outside the Coastal Zone, convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
<p>Discussion: According to the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the project parcel is designated as "Urban and Built-up Land", and therefore does not contain Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map (2018), accessed December 3, 2020.</p>					
2.b.	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, an existing Open Space Easement, or a Williamson Act contract?				X

<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not zoned for agriculture, protected by an existing Open Space Easement or a Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>Source: Project location; San Mateo County Zoning Map; San Mateo County Agricultural Preserves Map.</p>					
2.c.	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 forestland to non-forest use?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is located in a densely urbanized area of unincorporated Redwood City and therefore is not in an area identified as Farmland, suitable for agricultural activities, or considered forestland area.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>					
2.d.	For lands within the Coastal Zone, convert or divide lands identified as Class I or Class II Agriculture Soils and Class III Soils rated good or very good for artichokes or Brussels sprouts?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located within the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>					
2.e.	Result in damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel has not been identified as containing agricultural lands. The project site is classified as “urban land” according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service. Given the size of the parcel and the urbanized nature of the project area, there is no damage to soil capability or loss of agricultural land associated with the project, or that would result from future development.</p> <p>Source: United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey, accessed December 3, 2020.</p>					
2.f.	Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (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))? <i>Note to reader: This question seeks to address the economic impact of converting forestland to a non-timber harvesting use.</i>				X

Discussion: The project will result in an increase in the allowable density of development but will continue the designated use of the property for residential. In addition, the project parcel is not located in an area identified as forestland, timberland, or timberland zoned for timberland production.

Source: Project location; Project proposal; San Mateo County Zoning Map.

3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
3.a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X

Discussion: The rezoning of the property will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan as no development or construction activity is proposed.

Source: Project proposal; Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), 2017 Bay Area Clean Air Plan.

3.b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard?			X	
---	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The project will not generate any increase in criteria pollutant as the project does not propose any development. Future development would be subject to compliance with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, and any subsequently adopted requirements, to minimize any potential temporary increases in fugitive dust and exhaust emissions throughout construction to a less than significant level.

Source: Project proposal; BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017.

3.c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations as the project does not propose any development. Future construction may result in temporary emissions which have the potential to adversely impact nearby sensitive receptors (i.e., single-family residences); however, such future construction would be subject to the BAAQMD's Basic Construction Mitigation Measures, including any subsequently adopted requirements, to minimize any potential temporary exposure of pollutants to nearby sensitive receptors to a less than significant level.

Source: Project proposal; Project location; BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017.

3.d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?				X
<p>Discussion: The rezoning of the property will not generate any emissions as the project does not propose any development. Future development may result in temporary noise and odor emissions during construction; however, future noise emission associated with construction would be regulated by the County's Noise Ordinance and any odors generated from future construction would be temporary and minimal.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; San Mateo County Noise Ordinance.</p>				

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
4.a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a highly urbanized area of unincorporated Redwood City with the project parcel supporting existing residential development. There are no State or Federal mapped protected species located on the project site.</p> <p>Source: Project location; California Natura Diversity Database.</p>				
4.b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities located within the project area.</p> <p>Source: Project location; San Mateo County General Plan, Sensitive Habitats Map.</p>				
4.c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh,				X

vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				
<p>Discussion: There are no wetlands located within the project area.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>				
4.d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
<p>Discussion: There are no wildlife corridors or wildlife nursery sites in the project area. Given the urbanized nature of the project area, there are no substantial threats to native or migratory wildlife species.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Project proposal.</p>				
4.e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (including the County Heritage and Significant Tree Ordinances)?				X
<p>Discussion: The rezoning does not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Future development of the parcel may involve the removal of significant trees on the property; however, any such tree removal will be subject to County approval and regulated by the County's Significant Tree Ordinance. Furthermore, the project parcel does not contain any heritage trees.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; San Mateo County Significant Tree Ordinance.</p>				
4.f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: There is no Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans associated to the project parcel.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Community Conservation Plans Map, accessed December 3, 2020.</p>				
4.g. Be located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located inside or within 200 feet of a marine or wildlife reserve.</p>				

Source: Project location; United States Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wildlife Refuge System, accessed December 3, 2020.					
4.h.	Result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands?				X
Discussion: The rezoning will not result in loss of oak woodlands or other non-timber woodlands as no physical changes onsite are proposed with the rezoning of the property.					
Source: Project proposal.					

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
5.a.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?				X
Discussion: The project site consists of existing residential development built in 1978 and is not listed on any State or local historical registry. Thus, the rezoning, or any future redevelopment of the site, will not cause a substantial adverse impact to a historical resource.					
Source: Project proposal; Project location; California State Parks Office of Historic Preservation; San Mateo County General Plan.					
5.b.	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5?				X
Discussion: There are no known archaeological resources in the disturbed/developed area.					
Source: Project location; California State Parks Office of Historic Preservation; San Mateo County General Plan.					
5.c.	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
Discussion: There are no known human remains on the project site.					
Source: Project location.					

6. ENERGY. Would the project:				
--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
6.a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed rezone will not use or consume any on-site electricity or energy resources. Energy consumption associated with future construction is expected to be limited and temporary, and would be required to comply with State and local energy codes and standards, including but not limited to the County's Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan and Title 24 Energy Code standards with local amendments.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				
6.b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.				X
<p>Discussion: The rezoning of the property will not generate a demand for energy resources that would conflict or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. See staff's discussion in Section 6.a.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
7.a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving the following, or create a situation that results in:				
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? <i>Note: Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42 and the County Geotechnical Hazards Synthesis Map.</i>			X	

<p>Discussion: The project does not propose any development; however, the proposed rezoning would support future higher-density residential development. Active faults within San Mateo County include the San Andreas and Seal Cove faults, with the project site located approximately 2 miles from the San Andress fault. While the project property is not located in an earthquake fault zone according to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Hazard Maps, risks of loss, injury, or death resulting from surface rupture or ground shaking are greatest in densely developed, high-population areas. If the rezoning is approved, it would support future construction at a higher density of development. Any future construction will be subject to the California Building Code in effect at that time, which would require compliance with seismic code standards to maximize structural integrity and minimize loss of life or property in the event of an earthquake. Therefore, the project’s potential to indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death with respect to earthquake fault rupture would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location; Association of Bay Area Governments, Hazards Map Viewer, accessed December 3, 2020.</p>				
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose any development; however, the rezoning will support future higher-density residential development. The primary concern related to human exposure to ground shaking is that strong ground shaking can result in structural damage to buildings, potentially jeopardizing the safety of its occupants. The project parcel is expected to experience violent ground shaking for a high intensity 9 (Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI)) earthquake scenario according to the ABAG Hazard Maps. Any future construction will be required to adhere to applicable building codes to reduce the likelihood of potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, the project’s potential to indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death with respect to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location; Association of Bay Area Governments, Hazards Map Viewer, accessed December 3, 2020.</p>				
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and differential settling?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is located in an area identified as having a very low probability for earthquake liquefaction. As previously stated, the project proposes no development at this time; however, future development would be required to adhere to the California Building Code, including standards related to seismic hazards.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location; Association of Bay Area Governments, Hazards Map Viewer, accessed December 3, 2020.</p>				
iv. Landslides?				X
<p>Discussion: The project area consists of land identified as “flat land”, according to the ABAG Hazard Maps and therefore, is not in a landslide susceptibility area.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Association of Bay Area Governments, Hazards Map Viewer, accessed December 3, 2020.</p>				
v. Coastal cliff/bluff instability or erosion?				X

<i>Note to reader: This question is looking at instability under current conditions. Future, potential instability is looked at in Section 7 (Climate Change).</i>				
Discussion: The project parcel is not located near any coastal bluffs. Source: Project location.				
7.b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X
Discussion: The project does not involve any development or construction and therefore will not result in soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Given the relatively flat nature of the property, any future construction is not expected to result in significant soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Nonetheless, future construction would be required to adhere to the County's Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Best Management Practices for construction sites. Source: Project proposal.				
7.c.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, severe erosion, liquefaction or collapse?			X
Discussion: The project site is not known to be located on a geological unit or soil that is presently unstable. Furthermore, the proposed rezoning will not involve any physical alterations to the property. Source: Project proposal; Project location.				
7.d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of Uniform Building Code, creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X
Discussion: There are no known expansive soils associated with the project site. The site is currently developed and given a lack of previous failures, there is no expectation of encountering expansive soils which could result in a risk to life and/or property. Furthermore, the proposed rezoning will not involve any physical alterations to the property. Source: Project proposal; Project location.				
7.e.	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?			X
Discussion: The project parcel is currently served by a municipal wastewater provider. Preliminary approval has been provided by the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District to serve future maximum potential residential density under the proposed rezone and general plan amendment.				

Source: Project proposal; Project location; Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District.					
7.f.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
<p>Discussion: The project involves rezoning a property to support future higher-density residential development. While no development or construction is proposed at this time, based on the developed project site being located in a highly urbanized area, it is not expected that the project property hosts any paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location.</p>					

8. CLIMATE CHANGE. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
8.a.	Generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions (including methane), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X	
<p>Discussion: While no development or construction is currently proposed, the rezoning will serve to encourage future redevelopment of the property at a higher density. Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) include hydrocarbon air emissions from vehicles and machines fueled by gasoline. Based on the proposed rezone to R-3/S-3 (Multi-family residential/1,250 sq. ft. of lot area per dwelling unit), approval of the rezone would allow a maximum of 15 residential units on the property. Construction related vehicles and equipment associated with future development would be temporary and minimal with the implementation of BAAQMD Basic Construction Mitigation Measures for limiting vehicle idling times and maintaining and properly tuning construction equipment. Additionally, the maximum potential development of 15 residential units is below the BAAQMD's GHG screening criteria for multi-family residential development pursuant to Table 3-1 of the BAAQMD's May 2017 CEQA Guidelines.</p> <p>Source: Project plans; BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, May 2017.</p>					
8.b.	Conflict with an applicable plan (including a local climate action plan), policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X	
<p>Discussion: The proposed rezone will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. Future development will be required to comply with the San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan (EECAP) which identifies implementation measures for reduction of GHG emissions resulting from development consistent with State legislation, including construction idling. Further, see staff's discussion in Section 8.a. above.</p>					

Source: Project proposal; San Mateo County Energy Efficiency Climate Action Plan.					
8.c.	Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use, such that it would release significant amounts of GHG emissions, or significantly reduce GHG sequestering?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and therefore is not defined as forestland.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>					
8.d.	Expose new or existing structures and/or infrastructure (e.g., leach fields) to accelerated coastal cliff/bluff erosion due to rising sea levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located near a coastal cliff or bluff.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>					
8.e.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving sea level rise?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in an area susceptible to impacts from sea-level rise.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>					
8.f.	Place structures within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					
8.g.	Place within an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in an anticipated 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
9.a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials (e.g., pesticides, herbicides, other toxic substances, or radioactive material)?				X
<p>Discussion: No transport of hazardous materials is associated with the project.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				
9.b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The project would not involve the use or release of hazardous materials.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				
9.c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will not emit any hazardous emissions or involve the handling of hazardous materials, substances, or waste as the project involves no physical activity.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				
9.d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not identified as a hazardous materials site.</p> <p>Source: California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List (Cortese), accessed December 3, 2020.</p>				

9.e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X
<p>Discussion: The project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within 2 miles of any known airport.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>				
9.f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The project involves a privately-owned parcel. All future site improvements would be located within the parcel's boundaries with no expected impact to emergency response or evacuation plans.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>				
9.g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a highly urbanized area with no adjacent wildland areas.</p> <p>Source: Project location; California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Fire Hazard Severity Maps.</p>				
9.h. Place housing within an existing 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>				
9.i. Place within an existing 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in a 100-year flood hazard area.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>				

9.j.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in a dam failure area.</p> <p>Source: Project location; San Mateo County General Plan, Hazards Map.</p>					
9.k.	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in a tsunami or seiche inundation area. The project site is in a highly urbanized flat-terrain area of the County where mudflow is not a concern.</p> <p>Source: Project location; San Mateo County General Plan, Hazards Map.</p>					

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
10.a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality (consider water quality parameters such as temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical stormwater pollutants (e.g., heavy metals, pathogens, petroleum derivatives, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, oxygen-demanding substances, and trash))?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed rezone will not violate any water quality standard or waste discharge requirements. Future development would be required to comply with the County's drainage standards and the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit. Additionally, future development would be connected to existing public water and sewer service systems for this area.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>					
10.b.	Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed rezone will not decrease groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge as the project does not propose any physical development. Future development would connect to existing public water and sewer service systems for the area.</p>					

Source: Project proposal.				
10.c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:				
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed rezone will not involve any physical development on the site to cause erosion or siltation. The project site and surrounding area is flat. Future development is not expected to require significant grading; nonetheless, any future construction will be required to implement erosion and sediment control best management practices to ensure erosion and siltation is minimized.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location.</p>				
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is flat and does not contain any streams or rivers. The proposed rezone will not involve any physical development. Future development on the property would be required to incorporate permanent on-site stormwater treatment measures to capture runoff displaced by new development. Compliance with the County's drainage standards and County Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit will ensure that there are no substantial increases in the rate or amount of surface runoff associated with future development.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or				X
<p>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 10.c.ii. above.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is in a highly urbanized flat-terrain area of the County where flood flows are not a concern. The project site is not in or near a flood hazard area. Further, see staff's discussion in Section 10.c.ii. above.</p> <p>Source: Project location; Project proposal.</p>				

10.d.	In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is not located in a flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zone.</p> <p>Source: Project location; San Mateo County General Plan, Natural Hazards Map; Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map 06081C0303E, effective October 16, 2012.</p>					
10.e.	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed rezone will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Future development will be required to connect to existing public water and sewer service systems, and to comply with County drainage standards and the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>					
10.f.	Significantly degrade surface or ground-water water quality?				X
<p>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 10.a. and 10.b. above.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>					
10.g.	Result in increased impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?				X
<p>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 10.c.ii. above.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>					

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
11.a.	Physically divide an established community?				X
<p>Discussion: The project parcel is located in the Sequoia Tract area of San Mateo County, where residentially zoned parcels abut commercially zoned and developed parcels fronting Woodside Road. The project parcel is relatively larger in size compared to the surrounding residential parcels within the same existing R-1/S-74 zoning district, and abuts both commercial and multi-family development/zoned parcels. The proposed rezone will allow better utilization of the larger parcel for transitional multi-family residential development between the higher intensity commercial development along Woodside Road, the existing adjacent multi-family residential development, and</p>					

the lower density single-family residential Sequoia Tract neighborhood. Therefore, the proposed rezone will not result in the division of an established community.

Source: Project proposal; Project location.

11.b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
--	--	--	--	---

Discussion: The proposed rezoning would be consistent with the type and density of development in the surrounding area, which includes commercial, multi-family and single-family residential development. Further, see staff's discussion in 11.a. above. The subject initial study considers the applicable County General Plan and Zoning Regulations and supports that the proposed change in zoning and general plan designations would not result in any adverse impacts to plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental impact.

Source: Project proposal; Project location; San Mateo County General Plan, and Zoning Regulations.

11.c. Serve to encourage off-site development of presently undeveloped areas or increase development intensity of already developed areas (examples include the introduction of new or expanded public utilities, new industry, commercial facilities or recreation activities)?			X	
--	--	--	---	--

Discussion: The project proposes amending the zoning and general plan designation of the property, which will allow for future increased development density on the project site than exists today. Any future higher density development as a result of the subject project would be within the property's boundaries and would be sufficient only to serve the specific development proposal at the time.

Source: Project proposal.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
12.a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the State?				X
Discussion: The project parcel does not contain any known mineral resources.				
Source: San Mateo County General Plan, Mineral Resources Map.				

12.b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X
<p>Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 12.a.</p> <p>Source: San Mateo County General Plan, Mineral Resources Map.</p>				

13. NOISE. Would the project result in:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
13.a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose any development and therefore, will not generate any noise. Future construction may generate temporary increases in noise levels; however, future construction activity would be regulated by the County's Noise Ordinance.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; San Mateo County Noise Ordinance</p>				
13.b. Generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?				X
<p>Discussion: No development activity is proposed as part of the project; therefore, no ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise will be generated.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				
13.c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, exposure to people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or within 2 miles of a public airport.</p> <p>Source: Project location.</p>				

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
14.a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
<p>Discussion: The project will serve to accommodate additional future housing units, up to a maximum of 15 units. The future potential addition of up to 15 units to the already highly urbanized area would not result in substantial population growth. Any improvements necessary to serve future development will occur within the subject property's boundaries and would be sufficient only to serve development proposed on the project property.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				
14.b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
<p>Discussion: The project will serve to accommodate a greater number of future housing units than the single-family residence that is currently present onsite; therefore, the project will not result in the displace of substantial numbers of existing people or housing.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				

15. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, the 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:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
15.a. Fire protection?				X
15.b. Police protection?				X
15.c. Schools?				X
15.d. Parks?				X

15.e. Other public facilities or utilities (e.g., hospitals, or electrical/natural gas supply systems)?				X
<p>Discussion: The proposed rezone would result in the potential future development of 15 residential units on the property; however, the project site is located in a highly urbanized area that should not result in the need for new or altered government facilities.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location.</p>				

16. RECREATION. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
16.a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose any development; therefore, will not increase the use of existing parks or recreational facilities. The rezone would serve to support a future maximum of 15 residential units, which could generate an increase in the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities, however, any potential increase in use as a result of 15 additional units to the already highly urbanized area is not expected to result in a substantial physical deterioration of such facilities.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				
16.b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose any recreational facilities as no development is proposed.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				

17. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
17.a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation				X

system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and parking?				
<p>Discussion: The project proposes no development; however, would support a future potential maximum development density of 15 residential units on the 18,951 sq. ft. parcel. The project site is located along Sequoia Avenue, an improved public roadway, which includes curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements commencing at the north side of the project property and extending to Woodside Road. Any future development proposal on the project site is not expected to adversely impact access to existing public roadway or non-motorized travel or existing access to amenities along Woodside Road, including public transit stops. The future potential maximum development density (15 residential units) that the subject rezoning project would support would generate a total of 88 vehicle trips per day based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE's) Trip Generation Manual for a multi-family residential unit type development using 5.81 trips per unit. The maximum expected trip generation for a future development is below the County Department of Public Works Traffic Impact Study requirements and City/County Association of Government's (C/CAG's) Congestion Management Program Land Use Policy for requiring a traffic impact study. Furthermore, future residential development would be required to provide off-street parking in compliance with the parking requirements set forth in the County's Zoning Regulations. While it is not expected that any future maximum development project for the property would conflict with any plan, ordinance, or policy which establishes measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, any future development proposal would be subject to further County review at the time of proposal, including environmental review, as applicable, for compliance with CEQA.</p> <p>Source: Project location; San Mateo County Department of Public Works.</p>				
<p>17.b. Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) <i>Criteria for Analyzing Transportation Impacts?</i></p> <p><i>Note to reader: Section 15064.3 refers to land use and transportation projects, qualitative analysis, and methodology.</i></p>				X
<p>Discussion: The project proposes no development; however, would support a future potential maximum development density of 15 residential units on the 18,951 sq. ft. parcel. The project is screened from the requirement for a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) analysis pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 743 and Section 15064.3 of the CEQA Guidelines as a "small project" based on the State of California Governor's Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) December 2018 Technical Advisory for Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA to achieve compliance with SB 743 as the project would generate a future potential of less than 110 daily trips, refer to Section 17.a. Therefore, the project is self-mitigating based on the maximum permissible residential density that the rezoning would allow. Nonetheless, any future specific development proposal would be subject to further County review at the time of proposal, including environmental review, as applicable, for compliance with CEQA.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; State of California Governor's OPR December 2018 Technical Advisory; San Mateo County Department of Public Works, Board of Supervisors Members Memo, dated September 23, 2020 for Change to Vehicle Miles Traveled as Metric to Determine Transportation Impacts under CEQA Analysis; Caltrans Transportation Impact Study Guide, dated May 20, 2020.</p>				
17.c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp				X

curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose any development. Future development as a result of the project would be for residential use similar to the surrounding area and would be contained on private property and therefore would not generate an increase in hazards.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location.</p>				
17.d. Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
<p>Discussion: The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Direct access to the property is from Sequoia Avenue, an improved public roadway. There is no reason to believe that any future development on the parcel would result in inadequate emergency access; however, any future development proposal would be subject to review by the fire department and would be required to meet current fire code for ingress/egress.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location.</p>				

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
18.a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and contains a privately developed single-family residence constructed in 1978. Furthermore, the project site is not listed in any registers of historical resources, pursuant to any local ordinance or resolution as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), therefore, the project poses no impact.</p>				

Source: Project location; State Parks, Office of Historical Preservation, Listed California Historical Resources; County General Plan, Background, Historical and Archaeological Resources Appendices.					
ii.	A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. (In applying the criteria set forth in Subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.)				X
Discussion: See staff's discussion in Section 18.a.i. above.					
Source: See staff's references in Section 18.a.i. above.					

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:					
		<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
19.a.	Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose any development. The property and surrounding highly urbanized area are currently served public utilities, including but not limited to sewer, water, and electricity. Future development is expected to continue being served by these public utilities without the need for relocation or construction of new or expanded systems to serve it; however, further review for such needs would be completed at the time that a specific development proposal is filed with the County, including further review pursuant to CEQA, as applicable. Additionally, any future development would be required to include adequate on-site stormwater facilities to support the size of the development proposal, and engineered and designed to comply with the County's Drainage Standards and the County's Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location; Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District; California Water Service, Bear Gulch District.</p>					
19.b.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably				X

foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				
<p>Discussion: The project property is currently served by California Water Service, Bear Gulch District. The maximum future development density of the property as a result of this rezoning project would be 15 residential units. The project has been preliminarily reviewed by California Water Service, Bear Gulch District, and the District did not raise any objections to the ability to continue serving the property. The District will provide further review under any future development proposal filed with the County.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; California Water Service, Bear Gulch District.</p>				
19.c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?		X		
<p>Discussion: The project property is currently served by Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District. The District has completed a capacity analysis of the District's downstream facilities and determined that downstream pipes are expected to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional flows from the future maximum projected development potential of 15 residential units. However, the applicant shall mitigate the additional sewage to be generated by the site's change in use with a sanitary sewer project within the Sewer District to reduce the amount of inflow and infiltration (I/I) in its collection system. This mitigation measure is necessary to offset the project's effect on Sewer District and City of Redwood City sewer capacity limitations by reducing or eliminating wet weather inflow and infiltration from the Sewer District that would otherwise be conveyed to the downstream agencies' sewer systems. The Sewer District and the City of Redwood City's agreement, and the City of Redwood City's (City) agreement with the Silicon Valley Clean Water Agency (SVCWA) limit the amount of sewage that can be conveyed through the City's system, and to the SVCWA's plant. The District's preliminary calculations indicate that the applicant would need to replace approximately 145 - 407 linear feet of pipes within the Sewer District to mitigate the additional flows that would be generated from proposed future development resulting from the project. The applicant would be responsible for the cost of designing, constructing, and managing such improvement project. The future pipe replacement work would be located within the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District boundary and specifically determined at the time a future development project is filed with the County; however, the District boundary encompasses the highly urbanized areas of North Fair Oaks, Sequoia Tract and developed parts of Redwood City; therefore, such work would not be expected to generate any substantial adverse environmental impacts.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 1: The applicant shall be responsible for the cost of designing, constructing, and managing a sanitary sewer project within the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District boundary to reduce the amount of inflow and infiltration in its collection system and to offset additional flows generated from any future development of the project parcel. The design of the sanitary sewer project must be completed and approved by the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District prior to the issuance of a building permit on the project property.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location; Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District.</p>				
19.d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or				X

otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?				
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose any development to generate solid waste. Demolition and construction associated with any future development project would be required to implement a County approved Waste Management Plan for the purpose of reducing construction and demolition waste. Additionally, the property is located within Recology San Mateo County's solid waste service area who has indicated that service is available. Therefore, solid waste from any future development would not be expected to exceed any standards or capacity of local infrastructure. Recology San Mateo County transports solid waste to Ox Mountain Landfill who has an expected capacity/service life until 2034.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location; Recology San Mateo County.</p>				
19.e. Comply with Federal, State, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
<p>Discussion: The project does not propose any development to generate solid waste. See staff's discussion in section 19.d. above.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				

<p>20. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</p>				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
20.a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
<p>Discussion: The project involves the rezoning of a privately-owned parcel. No development is proposed as part of this project, and the project is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location; California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Fire Hazard Severity Maps.</p>				
20.b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a highly urbanized area and is not within or near an area of wildfire hazard concern.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location; California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Fire Hazard Severity Maps.</p>				

20.c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located in a highly urbanized area, does not involve any development, and is not located within or near an area of wildlife hazard concern. Therefore, the project does not require the provision of roads or fuel breaks, or additional powerlines or other utilities that may exacerbate fire risk or result in impacts to the environment.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location; California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Fire Hazard Severity Maps.</p>				
20.d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?				X
<p>Discussion: The project site is located on a flat parcel in a highly urbanized area without any nearby topographic slopes that could be subject to downslope flooding or landslides following a wildfire.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal; Project location.</p>				

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
	<i>Potentially Significant Impacts</i>	<i>Significant Unless Mitigated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
21.a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
<p>Discussion: No sensitive habitats are mapped in the project area. The project does not propose any development and the project site is located in a highly urbanized area of the County and supports existing residential development.</p>				

Source: Project proposal; Project location; California Natura Diversity Database.				
21.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.)		X		
<p>Discussion: The project would change the zoning and general plan designations to allow high density residential use of the property. While no construction is proposed as part of the project, the project would support a future potential for a maximum of 15 residential units on the property. Therefore, the project itself does not have significant impacts associated with its approval; however, a future development proposal as a result of the project may have the potential to create impacts. To the degree feasible, the preceding analysis has considered future potential development impacts and provided mitigation measures. However, any specific future development proposal would be subject to County review, including environmental review, as applicable, for compliance with CEQA.</p> <p>Source: Project proposal.</p>				
21.c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X		
<p>Discussion: The project would not generate any substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly, based on the analysis provided throughout this document and subject to the recommended mitigation measure to minimize any potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>Source: See sources referenced throughout the document.</p>				

RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES. Check what agency has permit authority or other approval for the project.

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Bay Area Air Quality Management District		X	
Caltrans		X	
City		X	
California Coastal Commission		X	
County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC)		X	
Other: _____		X	
National Marine Fisheries Service		X	

AGENCY	YES	NO	TYPE OF APPROVAL
Regional Water Quality Control Board		X	
San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)		X	
Sewer/Water District:		X	
State Department of Fish and Wildlife		X	
State Department of Public Health		X	
State Water Resources Control Board		X	
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (CE)		X	
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)		X	
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		X	

<u>MITIGATION MEASURES</u>		
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Mitigation measures have been proposed in project application.		X
Other mitigation measures are needed.	X	
<p>The following measures are included in the project plans or proposals pursuant to Section 15070(b)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measure 1:</u> The applicant shall be responsible for the cost of designing, constructing, and managing a sanitary sewer project within the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District boundary to reduce the amount of inflow and infiltration in its collection system and to offset additional flows generated from any future development of the project parcel. The design of the sanitary sewer project must be completed and approved by the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District prior to the issuance of a building permit on the project property.</p>		

DETERMINATION (to be completed by the Lead Agency).

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

X 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 of the mitigation measures in the discussion have been included as part of the proposed project. 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.



(Signature)

January 7, 2021

Senior Planner

Date

(Title)

ATTACHMENTS

Vicinity Map
Topographic Survey

_ND - Initial Study Checklist (07-17-19).dotx

General Plan Map Amendment and Rezone for APN 069-341-050 (PLN2020-00351)

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation Responsibility/Action	Implementation Timing	Monitoring and Enforcement Responsibility/Action
Utilities and Service Systems				
<p>Impact 1: The proposed project will result in the generation of additional sewage flow at the time of future development on the property.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 1: The applicant shall be responsible for the cost of designing, constructing, and managing a sanitary sewer project within the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District boundary to reduce the amount of inflow and infiltration in its collection system and to offset additional flows generated from any future development of the project parcel. The design of the sanitary sewer project must be completed and approved by the Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District prior to the issuance of a building permit on the project property.</p>	<p>Project Applicant shall design, construct, and manage the sewer project.</p> <p>Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District shall review, approve and inspect sewer project.</p>	<p>Applicant shall submit design for review prior to issuance of a building permit on the property.</p> <p>Applicant shall construct sewer project prior to building permit final for development on the property.</p>	<p>County Planning and Building Department shall confirm sewer project design is submitted to Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District prior to issuance of a building permit for development on the property.</p> <p>Fair Oaks Sewer Maintenance District shall inspect and approve construction prior to building permit final for development on the property.</p>