



# County of Santa Cruz

---

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
(831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD: (831) 454-2123

**KATHLEEN MOLLOY PREVISICH, PLANNING DIRECTOR**

[www.sccoplanning.com](http://www.sccoplanning.com)

## **NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT A NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

## **NOTICE OF PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT PERIOD**

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the following project has been reviewed by the County Environmental Coordinator to determine if it has a potential to create significant impacts to the environment and, if so, how such impacts could be solved. A Negative Declaration is prepared in cases where the project is determined not to have any significant environmental impacts. Either a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is prepared for projects that may result in a significant impact to the environment.

Public review periods are provided for these Environmental Determinations according to the requirements of the County Environmental Review Guidelines. The environmental document is available for review at the County Planning Department located at 701 Ocean Street, in Santa Cruz. You may also view the environmental document on the web at [www.sccoplanning.com](http://www.sccoplanning.com) under the Planning Department menu. If you have questions or comments about this Notice of Intent, please contact Todd Sexauer of the Environmental Review staff at (831) 454-3511.

The County of Santa Cruz does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and no person shall, by reason of a disability, be denied the benefits of its services, programs or activities. If you require special assistance in order to review this information, please contact Bernice Romero at (831) 454-3137 (TDD number (831) 454-2123 or (831) 763-8123) to make arrangements.

### **PROJECT: Isbel Drive Minor Land Division**

**APP #: 131175**

**APN(S): 068-241-11, 008-491-07**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Proposal for a 2-lot Minor Land Division to create two legal parcels, conforming to two existing Assessors' Parcel Numbers; with one parcel (APN: 068-241-11, zoned R-1-20) in County jurisdiction and the other parcel (APN: 008-491-07, zoned R-1-5) in the City of Santa Cruz, in conformance with the existing Santa Cruz City limit line. Requires a Minor Land Division, Site Area Variance, Riparian Exception, and an Archaeological Report Review.

**EXISTING ZONE DISTRICT: 068-241-11 is R-1-20; 008-491-07 is R-1-5**

**APPLICANT: Powers Land Planning**

**OWNER: Eva M. Pini, Trustee**

**PROJECT PLANNER: Sheila McDaniel, (831) 454-2255**

**EMAIL: [Sheila.McDaniel@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Sheila.McDaniel@santacruzcounty.us)**

**ACTION: Negative Declaration**

**REVIEW PERIOD: April 11, 2014 through April 30, 2014**

**This project will be considered** at a public hearing by the Planning Commission. The time, date and location have not been set. When scheduling does occur, these items will be included in all public hearing notices for the project.



# COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
(831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD: (831) 454-2123

**KATHLEEN MOLLOY PREVISICH, PLANNING DIRECTOR**

<http://www.sccoplanning.com/>

## NEGATIVE DECLARATION

**Project: Isbel Drive Minor Land Division**

**APN(S): 068-241-11, 008-491-07**

**Project Description:** Proposal for a 2-lot Minor Land Division to create two legal parcels, conforming to two existing Assessors' Parcel Numbers; with one parcel (APN: 068-241-11, zoned R-1-20) in County jurisdiction and the other parcel (APN: 008-491-07, zoned R-1-5) in the City of Santa Cruz, in conformance with the existing Santa Cruz City limit line. Requires a Minor Land Division, Site Area Variance, Riparian Exception, and an Archaeological Report Review.

**Project Location:** The property is located approximately 200 feet from the intersection of Market Street and Isbel Drive, in the City of Santa Cruz, at 190 Isbel Drive.

**Owner: Eva M. Pini, Trustee**

**Applicant: Powers Land Planning**

**Staff Planner: Sheila McDaniel, (831) 454-2255 E-mail: [Sheila.McDaniel@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:Sheila.McDaniel@santacruzcounty.us)**

This project will be considered at a public hearing by the Planning Commission. The time, date and location have not been set. When scheduling does occur, these items will be included in all public hearing notices for the project.

### California Environmental Quality Act Negative Declaration Findings:

Find, that this Negative Declaration reflects the decision-making body's independent judgment and analysis, and; that the decision-making body has reviewed and considered the information contained in this Negative Declaration and the comments received during the public review period, and; on the basis of the whole record before the decision-making body (including this Negative Declaration) that there is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect on the environment. The expected environmental impacts of the project are documented in the attached Initial Study on file with the County of Santa Cruz Clerk of the Board located at 701 Ocean Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Santa Cruz, California.

Review Period Ends: April 30, 2014

*Note: This Document is considered Draft until it is Adopted by the Appropriate County of Santa Cruz Decision-Making Body*

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
TODD SEXAUER, Environmental Coordinator  
(831) 454-3511



# County of Santa Cruz

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT

701 OCEAN STREET, 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060  
(831) 454-2580 FAX: (831) 454-2131 TDD: (831) 454-2123  
KATHLEEN MOLLOY PREVISICH, PLANNING DIRECTOR  
www.sccoplanning.com

## CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW INITIAL STUDY

Date: 3/24/2014

Application Number: 131175

Staff Planner: Sheila McDaniel

### I. OVERVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

APPLICANT: Powers Land Planning

APN(s): 068-241-11, 008-491-07

OWNER: Eva M Pini, Trustee

SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT: 1

**PROJECT LOCATION:** The property is located approximately 200 feet from the intersection of Market Street and Isbel Drive, in the City of Santa Cruz, at 190 Isbel Drive.

**SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Proposal for a 2-lot Minor Land Division to create two legal parcels, conforming to two existing Assessors' Parcel Numbers; with one parcel (APN 068-241-11, zoned R-1-20) in County jurisdiction and the other parcel (APN 008-491-07, zoned R-1-5) in the City of Santa Cruz, in conformance with the existing Santa Cruz City limit line. Requires a Minor Land Division, Site Area Variance, Riparian Exception, and an Archeological Report Review.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** All of the following potential environmental impacts are evaluated in this Initial Study. Categories that are marked have been analyzed in greater detail based on project specific information.

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

**DISCRETIONARY APPROVAL(S) BEING CONSIDERED:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> General Plan Amendment   | <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Development Permit           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Division | <input type="checkbox"/> Grading Permit                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rezoning                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Riparian Exception        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Development Permit       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Site area variance |

**NON-LOCAL APPROVALS**

Other agencies that must issue permits or authorizations: None required

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the lead agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Todd Sexauer  
Environmental Coordinator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS

Parcel Size: APN 068-241-11: 21,010 Gross (County limits)

APN 008-491-07 9,255 Gross (City Limits)

Existing Land Use: One single family dwelling

Vegetation: Ground cover with exception of large trees adjacent to Branciforte Creek and fruit trees on south side of property

Slope in area affected by project:  0 - 30%  31 – 100%

Nearby Watercourse: Branciforte Creek

Distance To: Creek generally follows northern property line

### ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Water Supply Watershed: No

Fault Zone: No

Groundwater Recharge: Yes

Scenic Corridor: No

Timber or Mineral: No

Historic: No

Agricultural Resource: No

Archaeology: Mapped Archaeological Resources, No presence of resources

Noise Constraint: No

Biologically Sensitive Habitat: Mapped for zayante band winged grasshopper and white-rayed pentachaeta, Branciforte Creek

Fire Hazard: No

Electric Power Lines: No

Floodplain: Flood Zone A within Creek

Solar Access: Yes

Erosion: No

Solar Orientation: South facing

Landslide: No

Hazardous Materials: No

Liquefaction: High Potential

Other:

### SERVICES

Fire Protection: County Fire

Drainage District: Zone 4

School District: Santa Cruz

Project Access: Isbel Drive

Sewage Disposal: Santa Cruz Sanitation

Water Supply: Santa Cruz

### PLANNING POLICIES

Zone District: 068-241-11: R-1-20

Special Designation: City of Santa Cruz

008-491-07: R-1-5 Per SC City

Sphere of Influence

General Plan: R-UVL (Residential Urban Very Low)

Urban Services Line:  Inside

Outside

Coastal Zone:  Inside

Outside

## **HISTORY**

Parcel "A" (APN 068-241-11, in County jurisdiction) is developed with a 1,572 square foot single-family residence and a 572 square foot garage that were built, according to Assessors' records, in 1961. Parcel "B" (APN 068-241-07-City of Santa Cruz jurisdiction) is undeveloped except for an abandoned well and fencing and is located within the City of Santa Cruz jurisdiction.

In pre-application discussions between the two jurisdictions, it was decided that the County of Santa Cruz would take the lead in review and processing of the proposed land division, with the City to follow the County approval with a Certificate of Compliance process for Parcel "B" (APN 008-491-07) that would establish all specific conditions and requirements for that parcel.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND SURROUNDING LAND USES:**

The property abuts the east side of Isbel Drive, a City-maintained street (Attachment 1-Vicinity Map). There are steep slopes near the northern border of APN 068-241-11, dropping down toward Branciforte Creek and its adjacent riparian vegetation. Riparian vegetation consists primarily of oak trees. The existing residence and garage on proposed Parcel "A" are located beyond the mapped riparian corridor. An existing split rail fence separates the wooded area from the rest of the residential development.

While the project area is mapped for archeological resource potential, an archeological reconnaissance conducted by Archeological Associates of Central California (Attachment 5) indicated that there is no presence of an archeological site on the property.

## **DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The applicant is proposing a two-lot Minor Land Division to create two legal parcels, conforming to two existing Assessors' Parcel Numbers, one parcel (Parcel A on APN 068-241-11, zoned R-1-20) in County jurisdiction and one parcel (Parcel B on APN 008-491-07, zoned R-1-5) in the City of Santa Cruz, in conformance with the existing Santa Cruz city limit line (Attachment 2). A site area variance is required for proposed Parcel A as it does not meet the minimum site area for the R-1-20 zone district. Parcel size is approximately 10,909 square feet net with deductions for riparian and right-of-way area.

No improvements are proposed on Parcel A located adjacent to the riparian corridor with exception of roadside improvements along Isbel Drive. All frontage improvements are proposed to be located within dedicated right-of-way along the edge of the Isbel Drive or within Parcel B located within the City of Santa Cruz. The improvements include construction of curb, gutter and sidewalk and dedication of property frontage for this purpose. Sidewalk construction requires removal of one oak tree, approximately 24 to 30 inches in diameter at breast height, located beyond the mapped riparian corridor

within a few feet of the back of existing curb. A riparian exception is required for construction of sidewalk improvements. A common driveway is proposed for access to both parcels, with a driveway easement across a portion of the Parcel "B" frontage for Parcel "A" ingress and egress. An existing sanitary sewer force main crosses the center portion of Parcel "B", and is proposed to be relocated into the side setback area of Parcel "B" and within an easement across the southeast corner of Parcel "A", where it would not inhibit future development on either parcel, as required by the City of Santa Cruz Sanitation District.

As the project improvements involve improvements within the City of Santa Cruz, the County Surveyor and City of Santa Cruz have agreed to require the improvement plans associated with this land division to be administrated by the City of Santa Cruz prior to issuance of a building permit for the new parcel rather than requiring the property owner to post a bond with the County for completion of the improvements in the City jurisdiction. Project conditions would address necessary procedural requirements to ensure that improvements are constructed meeting the City of Santa Cruz regulations related to frontage improvements, erosion control, etc.

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

### III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

#### A. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
| A. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| B. Strong seismic ground shaking?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| D. Landslides?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Discussion (A through D):** The project site is located outside of the limits of the State Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone (County of Santa Cruz GIS Mapping, California Division of Mines and Geology, 2001). However, the project site is located approximately 9 miles to the southwest of the San Andreas fault zone, and approximately 5 mile(s) to the southwest of the Zayante fault zone. While the San Andreas fault is larger and considered more active, each fault is capable of generating moderate to severe ground shaking from a major earthquake. Consequently, large earthquakes can be expected in the future. The October 17, 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake (magnitude 7.1) was the second largest earthquake in central California history.

All of Santa Cruz County is subject to some hazard from earthquakes. However, the project site is not located within or adjacent to a County or state mapped fault zone, therefore the potential for ground surface rupture is low. The project site is likely to be subject to strong seismic shaking during the life of the improvements. No improvements are proposed at this time. However, future residential improvements would be designed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code, which should reduce the hazards of seismic shaking and liquefaction to a less than significant level. There



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

is no indication that landsliding is a significant hazard at this site.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. | Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** Following a review of mapped information and a field visit to the site, there is no indication that the development site is subject to a significant potential for damage caused by on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. However, the property is mapped with a high liquefaction potential. No development is proposed at this time. However, future residential improvements would be designed in accordance with the Uniform Building Code, which should reduce the hazards of liquefaction to a less than significant level.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. | Develop land with a slope exceeding 30%? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** There are slopes that exceed 30% on the property that are associated with Branciforte Creek. However, no improvements are proposed in this area.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. | Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** Project improvements include the construction of curb, gutter, and sidewalk within the Isabel Drive right-of-way, relocation of sanitation sewer easements and associated sanitation force main, and construction of a 30 foot wide common driveway for both parcels. Since there are so few improvements associated with the land division, these improvements are proposed to be constructed prior to the issuance of a building permit for Parcel B with submittal and acceptance of improvement plans by the City of Santa Cruz as a condition of approval.

Some potential for erosion exists during the construction phase of the project; however, this potential is minimal because all construction and related improvement plans would be completed in compliance with the City of Santa Cruz standard erosion control specifications and County of Santa Cruz erosion control specifications, as noted on the plans. Standard erosion control plans include provisions for disturbed areas to be planted with ground cover and to be maintained to minimize surface erosion. Therefore, it is anticipated that erosion impacts would be less than significant.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. | Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Section 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

**Discussion:** There is no indication that the development site is subject to substantial risk caused by expansive soils.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 6. | Place sewage disposal systems in areas dependent upon soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, leach fields, or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** No septic systems are proposed. The existing parcel is served by the City of Santa Cruz Sanitation District (Attachment 7). The proposed lot would connect to the Santa Cruz City Sanitation District, and the applicant would be required to pay standard sewer connection and service fees that fund sanitation improvements within the district as a Condition of Approval for the project.

- |    |                                  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 7. | Result in coastal cliff erosion? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The proposed project is not located in the vicinity of a coastal cliff or bluff; and therefore, would not contribute to coastal cliff erosion.

**B. HYDROLOGY, WATER SUPPLY, AND WATER QUALITY**

Would the project:

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | Place development within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** The north edge of the subject property is located within Branciforte Creek and is within the 100 year floodplain. A hydraulic analysis prepared by Waterways Consulting, Inc., dated 10/15/2013 (Attachment 3) established that the base flood elevation is 43.14, as referenced to NGVD 29 datum. Planning staff converted the flood elevation to the base flood elevation provided for the newer datum required by the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Study (FEMA). The resulting base flood elevation is 45.9 feet and is entirely located within the Branciforte Creek channel. No portion of the existing residential development improvements or proposed lot lies within the 100-year flood hazard area. The Planning Department accepted this study (Attachment 4) with a condition of project approval that prior to recordation of the map the contours on the parcel map is updated to the newer datum required in the FEMA Flood Insurance Study.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. | Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

**Discussion:** See Item B-1 above.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. | Be inundated by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The subject property is not located within an area subject to a tsunami or mudflow as shown on the Tsunami map, dated January 2009.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. | Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project would obtain water from the City of Santa Cruz and would not rely on private well water. Although the project would incrementally increase water demand, the City of Santa Cruz has indicated that adequate supplies are available to serve the project (Attachment 6).

The project is located in a mapped groundwater recharge area. The Public Works drainage section, consistent with the regional water quality control board best management practices, requires that all storm water runoff from new development be retained on site so that predevelopment runoff levels are maintained. Preliminary approval has been provided by Public Works, finding that drainage on Parcel A would not be appreciably altered by the land division as no development is proposed there except sidewalk within the dedicated right-of-way to the City of Santa Cruz. Furthermore, Parcel B, located within the Santa Cruz City limits, and sidewalk improvements are subject to drainage approval by the City of Santa Cruz prior to issuance of a building permit for the new lot. This would ensure that the proposed impervious surface area is retained on-site, providing potential for groundwater recharge. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly impact groundwater recharge potential.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. | Substantially degrade a public or private water supply? (Including the contribution of urban contaminants, nutrient enrichments, or other agricultural chemicals or seawater intrusion). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project would not discharge runoff either directly or indirectly into a

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

public or private water supply. However, runoff from this project may contain small amounts of chemicals and other household contaminants. No commercial or industrial activities are proposed that would contribute contaminants. Potential siltation from the proposed project would be addressed through implementation of erosion control measures prior to construction of improvements associated with Parcel B located within the City of Santa Cruz.

6. Degrade septic system functioning?

**Discussion:** The project is located within the Urban Service Line where properties are served by the Santa Cruz Sanitation District and existing properties in the vicinity do not contain septic systems. Thus no impacts to systems would occur as a result of this project.

7. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding, on- or off-site?

**Discussion:** The proposed project is located adjacent to Branciforte Creek and the site slopes gradually in the direction of the creek. Proposed Parcel A contains an existing single family dwelling and no improvements are proposed in this area adjacent to Soquel Creek. Prior to building permit approval for the future dwelling and site improvements, drainage approval would be obtained from the City of Santa Cruz that would address the rate and amount of runoff in compliance with the drainage standards of the City of Santa Cruz. No significant changes in site drainage are proposed by the project.

8. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

**Discussion:** No improvements are proposed in the County of Santa Cruz. Department of Public Works Drainage staff has reviewed the project and have determined that existing storm water facilities are adequate to handle the minor increase in drainage associated with the project. Runoff associated with Parcel B would be located within the City of Santa Cruz. Future impervious surface areas are minor in nature and are associated with sidewalk and driveway improvements that would be directed to the Isbel right-of-way within the City of Santa Cruz. Project plans note that construction drawings will comply with the City of Santa Cruz regulations prior to construction. Refer to response B-5 for discussion of urban contaminants and/or

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

other polluting runoff.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 9. | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project is located upstream of Branciforte Creek and poses no risk to the proposed development from potential flooding because the proposed land division is located above the base flood elevation level of 45.9 (Attachment 3 and 4).

- |     |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 10. | Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** The proposed improvements associated with the land division (curb, gutter, sidewalk, relocation of sewer force main, and a shared driveway) are located within the Santa Cruz City limits. Plans indicate the improvements would comply with the City of Santa Cruz regulations. Improvements would be reviewed and approved for compliance with the City of Santa Cruz drainage standards prior to building permit issuance, when the improvements would be required to be constructed.

### C. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. | Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** According to the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB), maintained by the California Department of Fish and Game, the site is mapped as containing the zayante band winged grasshopper and white-rayed pentachaeta. However, a site visit by staff did not confirm the presence of these species on these special status species in the project area.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2. | Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations (e.g., wetland, native grassland, special forests, intertidal zone, etc.) or by the California Department of Fish | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

**Discussion:** The subject property is located along the southern edge of Branciforte Creek. The project improvements include proposed sidewalk along the eastern edge of Isbel Drive within the riparian corridor of Branciforte Creek. A riparian exception is required and included in the project application for this purpose.

Construction of frontage improvements are not anticipated to result in substantial adverse impacts to the riparian corridor provided that erosion control plans are implemented during construction. Project plans call out that construction would be in compliance with the City of Santa Cruz practices and regulations. This includes standard erosion control practices intended to prevent soil from depositing into the creek, which would potentially impact the riparian habitat. Thus, impacts to the corridor would to be less than significant.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native or migratory wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** The proposed project does not involve any activities that would interfere with the movements or migrations of fish or wildlife, or impede use of a known wildlife nursery site.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 4. Produce nighttime lighting that would substantially illuminate wildlife habitats? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** The development area is adjacent to a riparian corridor; however, the area directly adjacent to the riparian corridor is currently developed with a single family dwelling, and no additional residential improvements are proposed in the corridor, including site lighting. Furthermore, the proposed parcel is located beyond the riparian corridor and any lighting would be deflected by the existing residential dwelling. Thus, lighting impacts would be less than significant.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

**Discussion:** The project does not propose any work within federal jurisdiction that would require a section 404 permit. Furthermore, project plans show that sidewalk improvements adjacent to the riparian corridor include erosion control construction practices of the County of Santa Cruz and City of Santa Cruz to ensure that erosion does not run off into the creek during construction. These plan improvement would protect water quality. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 6. | Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (such as the Sensitive Habitat Ordinance, Riparian and Wetland Protection Ordinance, and the Significant Tree Protection Ordinance)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** The land division is proposed along the southern edge of the Branciforte Creek riparian corridor and is subject to the riparian protection ordinance. Curb, gutter and sidewalk are proposed along Isbel Drive in the area adjacent to the creek crossing; frontage improvements are therefore located within the required riparian buffer adjacent to where the roadway crosses over Branciforte Creek. No additional improvements are proposed in the riparian corridor. A riparian exception is included in the project application.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 7. | Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Discussion:** The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

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

**D. AGRICULTURE 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:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project site does not contain any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. In addition, the project does not contain Farmland of Local Importance. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Farmland of Local Importance would be converted to a non-agricultural use. No impact would occur from project implementation.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project site is zoned R-1-20 and R-1-5, which are not considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract. No impact is anticipated.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 3. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** No forest land occurs on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. No



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

impact is anticipated.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. | Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** No forest land occurs on the project site or in the immediate vicinity. No impact is anticipated.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 5. | Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project site is located within the Urban Service Line and not zoned for agricultural use, and located beyond any lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide, or Farmland of Local Importance would be converted to a non-agricultural use. In addition, the project site contains no forest land, and no forest land in the vicinity of the proposed project site. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

## E. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The site does not contain any known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. Therefore, no impact is anticipated from project implementation.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

**Discussion:** The project site is zoned R-1-20 in County jurisdiction and R-1-5 in City jurisdiction, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (M-3) nor does it have a Land Use Designation with a Quarry Designation Overlay (Q) (County of Santa Cruz 1994). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral

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

resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan would occur as a result of this project.

## F. VISUAL RESOURCES AND AESTHETICS

Would the project:

1. Have an adverse effect on a scenic vista?

**Discussion:** The project would not directly impact any public scenic resources, as designated in the County's General Plan (1994), or obstruct any public views of these visual resources.

2. Substantially damage scenic resources, within a designated scenic corridor or public view shed area including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

**Discussion:** The project site is not located along a County designated scenic road, public viewshed area, scenic corridor, within a designated scenic resource area, or within a state scenic highway. Therefore, no impact is anticipated.

3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridgeline?

**Discussion:** The property can be characterized as an urban infill site located within the urban service line that is designated for residential development. The residential land division would not alter the character of the residential area. In addition, no improvements are proposed that would alter the existing topography or ground surface. However, the development would provide frontage improvements connecting existing roadside improvements along Isbel Drive, which is in keeping with the urban infrastructure associated with residential development and this area. No impacts are anticipated.

4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

**Discussion:** The site contains an existing dwelling adjacent to Branciforte Creek on proposed Lot A. No lighting is proposed as part of this land division as a building is not

