



DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING RECOMMENDATION REPORT



CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: July 14, 2011
TIME: after 8:30AM
PLACE: Los Angeles City Hall
Room 350
200 N Spring Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

CASE NO: CPC 2011-536-CA
CEQA: ENV 2011-537-ND
LOCATION: Citywide
COUNCIL DISTRICT: All
PLAN AREAS: All

PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED

SUMMARY: A proposed ordinance amending Section 12.21 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) to identify permissible alternative paving materials for installation in driveways and parking lots.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS:

1. Adopt the staff report as its report on the subject.
2. Adopt the findings included in Attachment 1.
3. Adopt the Negative Declaration as the CEQA clearance on the subject.
4. Approve the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) and recommend its adoption by the City Council.

MICHAEL J. LOGRANDE
Director of Planning

LINN K. WYATT
Acting Chief Zoning Administrator

THOMAS ROTHMANN
City Planner, Code Studies Unit

ALAN BELL, AICP
Deputy Director

CHARLES J. RAUSCH JR.
Senior City Planner, Office of Zoning Administration

DEBORAH KAHEN
Planning Assistant, Code Studies Unit
Telephone: (213) 978-1202

ADVICE TO PUBLIC: *The exact time this report will be considered during the meeting is uncertain since there may be several other items on the agenda. Written communication may be mailed to the Commission Secretariat, 200 North Main Street, Room 272, Los Angeles, CA 90012 (Phone No. 213/978-1300). While all written communications are given to the Commission for consideration, the initial packets are sent a week prior to the Commission's meeting date. If you challenge these agenda items in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing agendaized herein, or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to this agency at or prior to the public hearing. As a covered entity under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the City of Los Angeles does not discriminate on the basis of disability, and upon request, will provide reasonable accommodation to ensure equal access to these programs, services, and activities. Sign language interpreters, assistive listening devices, or other auxiliary aids and/or other services may be provided upon request. To ensure availability of services, please make your request no later than three working days (72 hours) prior to the meeting by calling the Commission Secretariat at 213/978-1300.

SUMMARY

Interest in green building has grown rapidly in recent years. Modifications to the Los Angeles Municipal Code (LAMC) are necessary to keep pace with the evolution and popularity of green building techniques. Currently, the installation of alternatives to asphalt and concrete (alternative paving materials) in driveways and parking lots is not permitted by-right and can create construction delays. However, these materials provide environmental benefits over asphalt and concrete and should be encouraged in the City.

Streamlining the approval of alternative paving material installation furthers the City's interest in green development. The primary alternative is permeable paving materials. These materials provide the opportunity for stormwater to infiltrate into soil, helping facilitate aquifer recharge. Without permeable paving, stormwater and dry-weather water run-off gathers pollutants from vehicles, chemically fertilized gardens, and other sources as it cascades towards stormwater pipes. The stormwater pipes ultimately discharge the water, untreated, into the ocean.

The proposed ordinance (Appendix A) amends the LAMC to clearly identify which alternative paving materials are permitted for installation in driveways and parking lots.

STAFF REPORT

Initiation

Council issued motion 08-2519 which directed the City's Green Team (a former inter-departmental task force) to develop specific criteria for the installation of permeable paving materials in parking lots. In response, the Departments of Building and Safety, City Planning, Fire, and Public Works held joint meetings over the course of a year to develop the proposed criteria.

Background

The installation of permeable paving is a feasible way to satisfy, in part, several local regulations: the Green Building Program as initially adopted in 2008, and as amended in 2010, the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), and the pending implementation of the Low Impact Development (LID) policy.

Currently, the LAMC requires that the following areas be paved with asphalt or cement: parking lots; driveways; automobile storage areas; and automobile, manufactured home or trailer sales areas. Applicants may install alternative materials if they are deemed equivalent by the Department of Building and Safety. An exception allows grasscrete or a material deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning to be installed by-right in driveways only.

Therefore, in most instances, installing alternative permeable paving materials requires interpretation by either the Department of Building and Safety or City Planning. This case-by-case approval is inefficient for both applicants and staff. The proposed ordinance will streamline approval by clearly setting forth the criteria required for the installation of alternative paving material and eliminate a common need for interpretation by a department.

The criteria was jointly developed in a series of inter-departmental meetings among the Bureau of Engineering, Bureau of Street Services, Department of Building and Safety, Department of City Planning, Department of Public Works Sanitation, and the Fire Department, and shared with key stakeholders for review.

Public Hearing

A preliminary staff hearing was held on April 21, 2011. The proposed ordinance was presented with minor technical modifications from the initially published version. One person, a member of the United Neighborhoods Neighborhood Council, attended the meeting and spoke in full support of the ordinance.

Proposed Ordinance

The proposed ordinance does two things: (1) it defines the universe of alternative paving materials, and (2) it establishes criteria for allowable alternative paving material in both parking lots and driveways. This will create a uniform standard for both areas, provide transparency for the applicant, and end the common need for case-by-case interpretations by the City.

The universe of alternative paving materials is as follows: porous asphalt; porous concrete; permeable interlocking concrete pavers; permeable pavers; hard surface elastomeric paving; decomposed granite; crushed rock; gravel; restrained systems (a plastic or concrete grid system confined on all sides to restrict lateral movement, and filled with gravel or grass in the voids); Hollywood Driveways (two strips of concrete or pavers over dirt or vegetation); or recycled rubber. This list covers all common types of alternative paving materials available today.

The criteria for the aforementioned materials are as follows:

- (1) Any product installed within areas designated by the Fire Department as a fire lane must be approved by the Fire Department.
- (2) Permeable interlocking concrete pavers and permeable pavers shall have a minimum thickness of 80mm (3.14 inches).
- (3) If plantings are an element of the alternative paving material, the irrigation system shall not utilize potable water except for plant establishment.

- (4) Products and underlying drainage material shall be installed per manufacturers' specifications. Sub-grade soils shall be compacted as required per the product installation specifications.
- (5) Decomposed granite, crushed rock and gravel shall only be allowed for driveways and parking areas serving only one or two residential units.
- (6) All projects shall be compliant with all other provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code and any applicable standards or guidelines.

Conclusion

The proposed ordinance provides clear standards for allowable alternative paving installations. This will improve the efficiency of processing requests. Improving efficiency saves staff and applicant time, while also furthering the City's goal to become a greener, more livable city.

APPENDIX A

ORDINANCE NO. _____

A proposed ordinance amending Section 12.21 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which alternative paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots.

THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES DO ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. Paragraph (c) of Subdivision 6 of Subsection A of Section 12.21 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code is amended to read:

(c) Paving and Car Stops. Every parking area, every parking garage required by the provisions of this article, every automobile storage area (except those areas utilized for the temporary storage of automobiles for not to exceed six months in any calendar year), and every automobile, manufactured home or trailer sales area, and every ~~including access~~ driveways ~~to those areas~~, shall be paved with hard, durable asphaltic paving which has been mixed at a plant and is at least two inches thick after compaction, or with portland cement paving at least three inches thick, or ~~any material deemed equivalent by the Department of Building and Safety~~ with an alternative paving material as described below. All such areas shall have appropriate bumper guards, wheel stops, steel posts, walls, curbs, suitable landscaping or other installations adequate to prevent vehicles from parking or maneuvering on those portions of a lot upon which a driveway or parking area is prohibited, or into a public right of way, or where those portions of a lot are needed to prevent encroachment on walkways or adjoining properties.

~~Exception: Access driveways to the areas referenced above may be paved with a permeable material such as pavers, porous concrete, a combination of 45% concrete and 55% holes filled with grass distributed uniformly (commonly known as grasscrete), or any material deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning. (Added by Ord. No. 179,191, Eff. 11/5/07.)~~

Alternative Paving Materials. An alternative paving material is one of the following: porous asphalt; porous concrete; permeable interlocking concrete pavers; permeable pavers; hard surface elastomeric paving; decomposed granite; crushed rock; gravel; restrained systems (a

plastic or concrete grid system confined on all sides to restrict lateral movement, and filled with gravel or grass in the voids); Hollywood Driveways (two strips of concrete or pavers over dirt or vegetation); or recycled rubber. Alternative paving material are permitted for use in every parking area, automobile storage area, automobile, manufactured home or trailer sales area, and driveways, subject to the following:

- (1) Any product installed within areas designated by the Fire Department as a fire lane must be approved by the Fire Department.
- (2) Permeable interlocking concrete pavers and permeable pavers shall have a minimum thickness of 80mm (3.14 inches).
- (3) If plantings are an element of the alternative paving material, the irrigation system shall not utilize potable water except for plant establishment.
- (4) Products and underlying drainage material shall be installed per manufacturers' specifications. Sub-grade soils shall be compacted as required per the product installation specifications.
- (5) Decomposed granite, crushed rock and gravel shall only be allowed for driveways and parking areas serving only one or two residential units.
- (6) All projects shall be compliant with all other provisions of the Los Angeles Municipal Code and any applicable standards or guidelines.

Sec. 2. The City Clerk shall certify...

ATTACHMENT 1

LAND USE FINDINGS

The Department of City Planning recommends that the City Planning Commission find:

1. In accordance with Charter Section 556, that the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) is in substantial conformance with the purposes, intent, and provisions of the General Plan. Specifically, the proposed ordinance implements Infrastructure and Public Service Policy 9.6.2, to “establish standards and/or incentives for the use of structural and non-structural techniques which mitigate flood-hazards and manage stormwater pollution..”. The proposed ordinance establishes standards for the by-right installation of permeable and other alternative paving materials allowable in driveways and parking lots. In addition, Policy 9.6.3 states that “the City's watershed-based approach to stormwater management will consider a range of strategies designed to reduce flood hazards and manage stormwater pollution.” The proposed ordinance expands the range of options for property owners to capture stormwater onsite for infiltration, which in turn reduces added demand on the stormwater system, which decreases flood hazard. It also helps implement Objective 9.7 of the Infrastructure and Public Services Element, to “continue to develop and implement a management practices based stormwater program which maintains and improves water quality.” This ordinance further enables the installation of green techniques in projects that improve water quality; and
2. In accordance with Charter Section 558 (b) (2), the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) is in substantial conformance with public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice. Consistent with City policy that installing permeable paving materials in driveways and parking lots is an encouraged green building practice, the ordinance identifies how to install such materials by-right and removes permitting delays commonly experienced today.

ENVIRONMENTAL FINDING

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Negative Declaration (ENV-2011-537-ND) was published on March 1, 2011. On all measures the proposed ordinance (Appendix A) will have either no or a less than significant effect on the environment. The proposed ordinance makes no changes to existing zoning, any specific plans, or other land use regulations that affect the physical environment.

**CITY OF LOS ANGELES
 OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK
 ROOM 395, CITY HALL
 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
 NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

LEAD CITY AGENCY City of Los Angeles	COUNCIL DISTRICT CITYW	
PROJECT TITLE ENV-2011-537-ND	CASE NO. CPC-2011-536-CA	
PROJECT LOCATION Citywide		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION A proposed ordinance amending Section 12.21 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots.		
NAME AND ADDRESS OF APPLICANT IF OTHER THAN CITY AGENCY City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning 200 N Spring St., Room 701 Los Angeles CA 90012		
FINDING: The City Planning Department of the City of Los Angeles] propose• that a negative declaration be adopted for this project. The Initial Study indicates that no significant impacts are apparent which might result from this project's implementation. This action is based on the project description above.		
Any written comments received during the public review period are attached together with the response of the Lead City Agency. The project decision-make may adopt this negative declaration, amend it, or require preparation of an EIR. Any changes made should be supported by substantial evidence in the record and appropriate findings made.		
THE INITIAL STUDY PREPARED FOR THIS PROJECT IS ATTACHED.		
NAME OF PERSON PREPARING THIS FORM DEBORAH KAHEN	TITLE Planning Assistant	TELEPHONE NUMBER (213) 978-1202
ADDRESS 200 N. SPRING STREET, 7th FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA. 90012	SIGNATURE (Official)	DATE

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK

ROOM 395, CITY HALL

LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

INITIAL STUDY

and CHECKLIST

(CEQA Guidelines Section 15063)

LEAD CITY AGENCY: City of Los Angeles	COUNCIL DISTRICT: CITYW	DATE: 03/01/2011
RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES: Department of City Planning		
ENVIRONMENTAL CASE: ENV-2011-537-ND	RELATED CASES: CPC-2011-536-CA	
PREVIOUS ACTIONS CASE NO.:	<input type="checkbox"/> Does have significant changes from previous actions. <input type="checkbox"/> Does NOT have significant changes from previous actions	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: PERMEABLE PAVING ORDINANCE		
ENV PROJECT DESCRIPTION: A proposed ordinance amending Section 12.21 of the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots.		
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS: The City of Los Angeles is the second largest city in the United States by population with an estimated 4 million residents. The city's boundaries cover a total area of 498.3 square miles (1,291 km ²), comprising 469.1 square miles (1,214.9 km ²) of land and 29.2 square miles (75.7 km ²) of water, reflecting a diverse terrain of urbanized areas, beaches, mountains, and valleys. The City of Los Angeles is divided into 15 City Council districts and 35 Community Plan Areas.		
PROJECT LOCATION: Citywide		
COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: CITYWIDE STATUS: <input type="checkbox"/> Does Conform to Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Does NOT Conform to Plan	AREA PLANNING COMMISSION: CITYWIDE	CERTIFIED NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL: CITYWIDE
EXISTING ZONING: N/A	MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY ZONING: N/A	LA River Adjacent: YES
GENERAL PLAN LAND USE: N/A	MAX. DENSITY/INTENSITY ALLOWED BY PLAN DESIGNATION: N/A	
	PROPOSED PROJECT DENSITY: N/A	

Determination (To Be Completed By 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 will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions on the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find 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 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.

Planning Assistant

(213) 978-1202

Signature

Title

Phone

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 in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to "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 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: A sources list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> AESTHETICS	<input type="checkbox"/> GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS	<input type="checkbox"/> POPULATION AND HOUSING
<input type="checkbox"/> AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES	<input type="checkbox"/> HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	<input type="checkbox"/> PUBLIC SERVICES
<input type="checkbox"/> AIR QUALITY	<input type="checkbox"/> HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	<input type="checkbox"/> RECREATION
<input type="checkbox"/> BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	<input type="checkbox"/> LAND USE AND PLANNING	<input type="checkbox"/> TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC
<input type="checkbox"/> CULTURAL RESOURCES	<input type="checkbox"/> MINERAL RESOURCES	<input type="checkbox"/> UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS
<input type="checkbox"/> GEOLOGY AND SOILS	<input type="checkbox"/> NOISE	<input type="checkbox"/> MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST (To be completed by the Lead City Agency)

Background

PROPOSANT NAME:

City of Los Angeles, Department of City Planning

PHONE NUMBER:

(213) 978-1202

APPLICANT ADDRESS:

200 N Spring St., Room 701
Los Angeles CA 90012

DATE SUBMITTED:

02/28/2011

AGENCY REQUIRING CHECKLIST:

Department of City Planning

PROPOSAL NAME (if Applicable):

Permeable Paving Ordinance

Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

I. AESTHETICS			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			✓
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			✓
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?			✓
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			✓
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES			
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?			✓
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			✓
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?			✓
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			✓
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			✓
III. AIR QUALITY			
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			✓
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			✓
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			✓
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			✓
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			✓
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			✓
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?			✓
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			✓
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			✓
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			✓
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			✓
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES			

Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?				✓
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?				✓
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				✓
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				✓
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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.				✓
b. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Strong seismic ground shaking?				✓
c. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				✓
d. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Landslides?				✓
e. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				✓
f. 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?				✓
g. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				✓
h. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?				✓
VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?				✓
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				✓
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				✓
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				✓
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				✓
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				✓
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				✓
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				✓

	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				✓
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				✓
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				✓
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				✓
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				✓
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				✓
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				✓
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				✓
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				✓
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				✓
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				✓
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING				
a. Physically divide an established community?				✓
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				✓
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				✓
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				✓
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				✓
XII. NOISE				
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				✓
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				✓
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✓
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				✓

Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				✓
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				✓
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				✓
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection?				✓
b. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Police protection?				✓
c. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Schools?				✓
d. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Parks?				✓
e. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Other public facilities?				✓
XV. RECREATION				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				✓
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				✓
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				✓

	Potentially significant impact	Potentially significant unless mitigation incorporated	Less than significant impact	No impact
--	--------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

- b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e. Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?
- b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?
- c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Note: Authority cited: Sections 21083, 21083.05, Public Resources Code. Reference: Section 65088.4, Gov. Code; Sections 21080, 21083.05, 21095, Pub. Resources Code; *Eureka Citizens for Responsible Govt. v. City of Eureka* (2007) 147 Cal.App.4th 357; *Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency* (2004) 116 Cal.App.4th at 1109; *San Franciscans Upholding the Downtown Plan v. City and County of San Francisco* (2002) 102 Cal.App.4th 656.

DISCUSSION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

The Environmental Impact Assessment includes the use of official City of Los Angeles and other government source reference materials related to various environmental impact categories (e.g., Hydrology, Air Quality, Biology, Cultural Resources, etc.). The State of California, Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology - Seismic Hazard Maps and reports, are used to identify potential future significant seismic events; including probable magnitudes, liquefaction, and landslide hazards. Based on applicant information provided in the Master Land Use Application and Environmental Assessment Form, impact evaluations were based on stated facts contained therein, including but not limited to, reference materials indicated above, field investigation of the project site, and any other reliable reference materials known at the time.

Project specific impacts were evaluated based on all relevant facts indicated in the Environmental Assessment Form and expressed through the applicant's project description and supportive materials. Both the Initial Study Checklist and Checklist Explanations, in conjunction with the City of Los Angeles's Adopted Thresholds Guide and CEQA Guidelines, were used to reach reasonable conclusions on environmental impacts as mandated under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The project as identified in the project description will not cause potentially significant impacts on the environment. Therefore, this environmental analysis concludes that a Negative Declaration shall be issued for the environmental case file known as **ENV-2011-537-ND** **ENV-2011-537-ND** and the associated case(s), **CPC-2011-536-CA**.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

All supporting documents and references are contained in the Environmental Case File referenced above and may be viewed in the EIR Unit, Room 763, City Hall.

For City information, addresses and phone numbers: visit the City's website at <http://www.lacity.org>; City Planning - and Zoning Information Mapping Automated System (ZIMAS) cityplanning.lacity.org/ or EIR Unit, City Hall, 200 N Spring Street, Room 763. Seismic Hazard Maps - <http://gmw.consrv.ca.gov/shmp/>
Engineering/Infrastructure/Topographic Maps/Parcel Information - <http://boemaps.eng.ci.la.ca.us/index01.htm> or
City's main website under the heading "Navigate LA".

PREPARED BY:	TITLE:	TELEPHONE NO.:	DATE:
DEBORAH KAHEN	Planning Assistant	(213) 978-1202	03/09/2011

APPENDIX A: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS EXPLANATION TABLE

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
I. AESTHETICS			
	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the substantial damage of, nor make easier to substantially damage, scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in substantial degradation of, nor make easier to substantially degrade, the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES			
	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not lead to the conversion of, nor make easier to convert, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance	NA

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	IMPACT	(Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Codes section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Codes section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g)); as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a loss of forestland or conversion of forest land to non-forest use; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
e.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not involve, nor make easier to involve, other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA

III. AIR QUALITY

	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not conflict or obstruct, nor make easier to conflict or obstruct, the implementation of the application air quality management plan (AQMP); as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not violate, nor make easier to violate, any air quality standard or contribute substantially to, nor make easier to contribute substantially to, an existing or projected air quality violation; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors); as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the exposure of, nor make easier to expose, sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
e.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES			
	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, 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; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, 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; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not interfere substantially with, nor make easier to interfere substantially with, the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
e.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not conflict with, nor make easier to conflict with, any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
f.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not conflict with, nor make easier to conflict with, the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES			
	-	The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions	-

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
		<p>require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not cause, nor make easier to cause, a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not cause, nor make easier to cause, a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in § 15064.5; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not cause, nor make easier to cause, a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in § 15064.5; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not encourage the direct or indirect destruction, nor make easier to directly or indirectly destroy, a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
e.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the disturbance of, nor make easier to disturb, any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the exposure of, nor make easier to expose, people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the	NA

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
		risk of loss, injury, or death involving: 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 (in reference to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42); as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the exposure of, nor make easier to expose, people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: strong seismic ground shaking; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the exposure of, nor make easier to expose, people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the exposure of, nor make easier to expose, of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: landslides; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
e.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
f.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not encourage, nor make easier, the use of permeable paving materials for driveways or parking lots 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; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
g.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not encourage, nor make easier, the use of permeable paving materials for driveways or parking lots on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
h.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
VII. GREEN HOUSE GAS EMISSIONS			
	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not lead to the generation of, nor make	NA

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	IMPACT	easier to generate, greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in a conflict with, nor make easier to conflict with, an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, 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; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the emission of, nor make easier to emit, hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not encourage the location of, nor make easier to locate, the use of permeable paving materials for driveways or parking lots 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 create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
e.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, in a safety hazard for people residing or working in a project area located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
f.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a safety hazard for people residing or working in a project area within the vicinity of a private airstrip; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
g.	NO	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not impair the implementation of or	NA

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
	IMPACT	physically interfere, nor make easier to impair the implementation of or physically interfere, with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	
h.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the exposure of, nor make easier to expose, people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY			
	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the violation, nor make easier to violate, any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, the substantial depletion of groundwater supplies or result in the substantial interference of, or make easier to substantially interfere 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 preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the substantial alteration of, nor make easier the substantial alteration of, the existing drainage patterns of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or situation on- or off-site; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the substantial alteration of, nor make easier the substantial alteration of, the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or will it result in the substantial increase of, nor make easier the substantial increase of, the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
e.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the creation of or contribution to, nor make easier to create or contribute to, runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
f.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, otherwise substantially degrade water quality; as defined by the California Environmental	NA

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
		Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	
g.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the placement of, nor make easier the placement of, housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
h.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the placement of, nor make easier the placement of, structures in a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
i.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the exposure of, nor make easier the exposure of, people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure or a levee or dam; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
j.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the inundation by, nor make easier the inundation by, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the physical division of, nor make easier the physical division of, an established community; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier, a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier, a conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact would result.	NA

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

	-	The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.	-
--	---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
		<p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result, nor make easier to 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; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to 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; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
XII. NOISE			
	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, the substantial (temporary or periodic) increase in ambient noise levels; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING			
	-	The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions	-

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
		<p>require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the inducement of, nor make easier to induce, a substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure); as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the displacement of, nor make easier to displace, a substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in the displacement of, nor make easier the displacement of, a substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	-
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, the substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for one of the public services: Fire protection; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically	NA

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
		altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for an of the public services: Police protection; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for an of the public services: Schools; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for an of the public services: Parks; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
e.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for an of the public services: Other public facilities; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
XV. RECREATION			
	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, an increase in the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not encourage, or make easier, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC			
	-	The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions	-

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
		<p>require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the country congestion management agency for designated roads or highways; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, the substantial increase of hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment); as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
e.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, inadequate emergency access; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
f.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks); as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS			
	-	<p>The proposed code amendment will revise the Los Angeles Municipal Code to clarify which permeable paving materials are permissible for driveways and parking lots. Current provisions require that any material used in parking lots must be, or must be equivalent to, asphalt or concrete. The Department of Building and Safety currently makes this determination on a case-by-case basis. Driveways have an exception to this provision insomuch that a few permeable materials are explicitly permissible, and any other material must be deemed equivalent by the Department of City Planning, also on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>The proposed code amendment does not include language dictating specific physical development criteria. It only amends existing zoning code to establish clear criteria that must be met for parking lot and driveway materials in order to be administratively approved. The</p>	-

	Impact?	Explanation	Mitigation Measures
		<p>criteria are currently used in determining case-by-case review. Therefore, no change in allowable materials is being made. This code change will merely make the requirements more transparent and decrease staff and applicant process time.</p> <p>Without exception, all future project applications relevant to the proposed code amendment will still be subject to CEQA review of other similar development applications that are not installing permeable materials in a driveway or parking lot. Consequently...</p>	
a.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment does not encourage the exceeding of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Control Board; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not require or result in, nor make easier the requirement or to result in, the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment does not encourage the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
d.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment does not result in, nor make easier to result in, a project without sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from entitlements and resources, either existing, new or expanded; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
e.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, the potential for a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve a project that the project does or does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
f.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a project that is or is not served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate a project's solid waste disposal needs; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
g.	NO IMPACT	...adoption of the proposed code amendment will not result in, nor make easier to result in, a conflict with any federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste; as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No adverse impact will result.	NA
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE			
a.	NO IMPACT	As drafted, the proposed code amendment does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantial reduce the critical habitat of fish or wildlife species, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or result in the decline of any animal or plant species. No impact.	NA
b.	NO IMPACT	Potential impacts in all CEQA impact categories result in less than significant impacts. Therefore, the proposed code amendment's impacts are not cumulatively considerable, and no further cumulative impacts analysis is required.	NA
c.	NO IMPACT	The proposed code amendment does not have the potential to create significant impacts resulting in substantial environmental effects having a direct or indirect impact on human beings.	NA