

REQUEST FOR HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ACTION

V.A. DBSS BROCKTON LLC, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER: JAZMIN SERRATO)

PUBLIC HEARING to consider **Demolition No. 383** – A request to demolish an approximately 1,570 square-foot single-family residence, an approximately 375 square-foot patio, and an approximately 950 square foot garage located at 520 Ruiz Street (APN: 0169-156-10-0000) within the Village Center (VC) District of the Transit Villages Specific Plan. This proposal may qualify for exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301(I)(1) (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines.

HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION MEETING: June 1, 2023

Planner: Jazmin Serrato, Junior Planner

Reviewed by: Brian Foote, City Planner/Planning Manager

PROCEDURE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. Chairperson declares the meeting open as a public hearing.
2. Chairperson calls upon staff for report.
3. Chairperson calls for questions/comments from members of the Commission.
4. Chairperson calls upon applicant, or its representative, for comments/testimony.
5. Chairperson calls for comments/questions/testimony from members of the public (3 minutes per speaker).
6. Chairperson calls upon the applicant, or representative, for rebuttal comments (5 minutes).
7. Chairperson closes the public hearing.
8. Commission considers the motion(s) and votes.

SYNOPSIS

1. Historic Designation: The structure is not designated as a historic resource, nor is it located within a historic district, designated by the City of Redlands, the State of California, or the United States Government.
2. Existing Land Use: Zoning: Transit Villages Specific Plan – Village Center (VC) District
General Plan: Transit Village
3. Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission submittal dates:

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| (A) Submittal Dates: | April 4, 2023 |
| (B) Date Deemed Complete: | April 27, 2023 |
| (C) Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission Meeting: | June 1, 2023 |

4. Attachments:

- (A) Location Map & Aerial Photograph
- (B) Site Photographs
- (C) Preliminary Environmental Checklist
- (D) Resolution No. 2023-13 with Exhibit A (Conditions of Approval)

PROPOSAL

The applicant, DBSS Brockton, LLC, has submitted an application to demolish an approximately 1,570 square-foot single-family residence, an approximately 375 square-foot patio, and an approximately 950 square foot garage located at 520 Ruiz Street (APN: 0169-156-10-0000) within the Village Center (VC) District of the Transit Villages Specific Plan. Based on historic aerial photographs, city directories, and building permits the home is over 50 years of age.

BACKGROUND

The building permit records for this property indicate the residence and original garage were built in 1951. George H. Kronage received a permit for the construction of a residence and garage on October 11, 1950. Additional permits indicate the rear patio and an addition to the garage were constructed in 1959 by the owner of the property at the time, Isabelo Lopez. In 2022, the subject property was purchased by DBSS Brockton, LLC. The property recently has faced several cases of trespassing and vandalism. The applicant proposes to demolish the structures on site for possible future development.

SUMMARY

The San Bernardino County Assessor's Office records indicate that the residence was constructed in 1951. Historic aerials confirm the placement of the dwelling, patio, and detached garage in the 1959 aerial image. The City's directories begin to list the individuals that were associated with the subject property in 1954. Based on historic aerial images, City directories, and building permit records associated with the subject property, the dwelling and the accessory structures are at least 50 years of age.

The 1,570 square-foot single family residence resembles a Neo-Mediterranean design of the Spanish Eclectic variety featuring stucco walls and three rounded arches at the front façade, and a low-pitched gable roof. The garage and patio incorporate a more simplistic design. The southern portion of the garage features stucco walls and a low pitch gabled roof, whereas the northern portion is a wooden carport addition. The patio is a wooden

addition with concrete masonry blocks, some of which feature decorative elements at the front façade. Historic aerial images and newspapers of the time of development indicate the subject property was surrounded by single-family developments in all directions. Since that time, the single-family residences to the north and east have remained, but the parcels to the south and west have become vacant.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

City staff prepared a Preliminary Environmental Checklist for the proposed project in accordance with Section 15.44.060 of the Redlands Municipal Code, which requires an environmental checklist be prepared for all demolition permit applications involving structures over 50 years old. This checklist provides an environmental analysis of the project that confirms that with the Commission's concurrence, the structures are not considered "historic resources" or "eligible resources," and that demolition of the structures would qualify for a Notice of Exemption pursuant to Section 15301 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines.

Section 15301(l) of the California Environmental Quality Act states that the demolition and removal of individual small structures including accessory structures, is exempt from environmental review. In addition, Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act refers to the California Public Resource Code, which provides guidance as to what is considered a "historic resource" or "eligible resource". The criteria consists of the following:

- It is associated with events which have made a significant contribution to California's history and cultural heritage.
- It is associated with the lives of persons important to our past.
- The architecture embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or possesses high artistic values.
- The potential to yield any information important to history or pre-history.

After conducting research on the subject parcel, staff concluded that there is no evidence that the site or structure is associated with any historical event or person that contributes to the history of the United States, California, San Bernardino County, or the City of Redlands. In addition, the structure does not embody any distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, method of construction or high artistic value, nor does the structure present any potential to yield any information important to history or pre-history. Further details of this analysis are included below and in the Preliminary Environmental Checklist Form (Attachment C).

ANALYSIS

The procedures outlined in RMC Section 2.24.090 through Section 2.24.140 apply to the demolition of property recorded in the City of Redlands List of Historic Resources. The subject property is not recorded in the list of local historic resources and is not subject to the procedures in Section 2.24 of the Redlands Municipal Code. However, Section 15.44.070 requires that prior to the demolition of any structure over 50 years old, the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission is required to determine whether the structure is historically significant. RMC Section 2.62.170 establishes the City's criteria for historic significance. Below, each City criteria is listed with justification as to why this structure is not historically significant.

A) Local Criteria for Significance

RMC Section 2.62.170(A): It has significant character, interest, or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City of Redlands, State of California, or the United States.

The building permit records for this property indicate the residence and original garage were built in 1951. George H. Kronage received a permit for the construction of a residence and garage on October 11, 1950. Additional permits indicate the rear patio and an addition to the garage were constructed in 1959 by the owner of the property at the time, Isabelo Lopez. The building permits that are on file for the subject property include the following:

Permit Type	Year Issued	Work Proposed
Building Permit	October 11, 1950	Main residence and garage
Plumbing Permit	October 11, 1950	Plumbing
Electrical Permit	October 17, 1950	Wiring
Building Alterations Permit	May 25, 1959	Rear Patio
Building Permit	August 18, 1959	Garage
Building Alterations Permit	July 22, 1964	Residence alteration
Grading Permit	December 9, 1971	Grading
Plumbing Permit	April 24, 1975	Plumbing
Building Alterations Permit	April 29, 1975	Room addition
Building Alterations Permit	November 25, 1975	Fireplace
Building Permit	August 17, 1979	Room conversion

Building Permit	August 13, 1984	Porch
Building Permit	November 7, 1984	Patio
Plumbing Permit	August 30, 2010	Plumbing

Based on historic aerial images, City directories, and building permit records associated with the subject property, the dwelling and the accessory structures are at least 50 years of age. Staff also conducted research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through newspaper.com. The newspaper search and research conducted at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room revealed that the individuals that were associated with the subject property were primarily a housewife and a caster. RMC Section 2.62.170(C) listed below has more information regarding the individuals that are associated to the subject property. Overall, there is no significant evidence that this structure makes a significant contribution to the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the city, State, or County.

RMC Section 2.62.170(B): It is the site of a significant historic event.

Based on the research conducted by staff through local and regional newspaper database searches, building records, and ownership history, it has been determined that the property is not the site of a significant historic event.

RMC Section 2.62.170(C): It is strongly identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture, history, or development of the city.

Staff conducted research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through newspaper.com. The corresponding building permit records and Sanborn maps indicate the property was previously addressed 520 Second Street and it appeared as such within the directories. The property first appeared in the directories in 1954. The table (below) lists the residents associated with the subject property based on the information obtained from the City Directories located at the A.K. Smiley Library's Heritage Room and the San Bernardino County Assessor's Records.

Directory Year	Name(s)	Occupation	Additional Information
1950	Kronage, George H.	Occupation not listed on building permit.	The owner built main dwelling and garage.
1954	Garcia, Violette Hazel	Housewife Husband not listed.	First directory where 520 Second Street was found.

1958 – 2003	Lopez, Isabelo C Lopez, Trinidad T	Caster employee at Universal Rundle Occupation not listed.	Building permits show him as the owner in 1959.
2022 – Present	DBSS Brockton LLC	Not listed.	Listed on San Bernardino County Assessors since 12/29/2022.

Newspapers from the Redlands Daily facts from June 5, 1959, indicate the subject property was a part of Tract No. 3632. These developments included 28 single-family residences owned and developed by George H. Kronage. No information was found regarding the first owner listed in the directories, Violette Hazel Garcia. Newspapers from 1960 to 1974, indicate Isabelo Lopez was a member of Philip Marmolego Post No. 650 of the American Legion Post who became commander from 1966 to 1967. His wife, Trinidad Lopez, was an involved member of St. Mary’s Church and Mariposa’s Elementary Parent Teacher’s Association. The individuals associated with the subject property were involved members of their community, but newspapers do not indicate them as important figures. The individuals that were associated to the subject property had working-class occupations and are not known to have significantly contributed to the culture, history, or development of the city.

RMC Section 2.62.170(D): It is one of the few remaining examples in the city possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural type or specimen.

The 1,570 square-foot single family residence resembles a Neo-Mediterranean design of the Spanish Eclectic variety featuring stucco walls and three rounded arches at the front façade, and a low-pitched gable roof. The front façade of the dwelling also features two windows with aluminum patio covers and the main entry incorporates three steps of stairs leading to a front porch area including a door entry and a large front window. The lower portion of the main entry also features a brick design. At the rear portion of the residence there is a detached patio structure and a detached garage. The detached patio structure, approximately 375 square-feet in size, is a wooden addition combined with supporting pillars of concrete masonry blocks, some of which feature decorative elements at the front façade. The detached garage, approximately 950 square-feet in size, features stucco walls and a low pitch gabled roof similar to the main dwelling at the southern portion and the northern portion consists of a wooden carport addition. The dwelling and accessory structures have a simple design, and their Neo-Mediterranean elements are modest and understated. These structures are not one of the few remaining examples in the city possessing distinguishing characteristics of this architectural type or specimen.

RMC Section 2.62.170(E): It is a notable work of an architect or master builder whose individual work has significantly influenced the development of the city.

A local and regional newspaper records database search was conducted for the subject site. The city's building permits for the main residence and original garage list George H. Kronage as the owner and contractor and do not list a builder or architect. Building permits also indicate the builder and owner of the detached rear patio and garage addition was Isabelo Lopez. There is no evidence of these contractors being master builders. Given the simplicity of the residential building, and limited amount of information discovered researching the property, staff assumes that the building is not the notable work of an architect or master builder.

RMC Section 2.62.170(F): It embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represents a significant architectural innovation.

As discussed under Section 2.62.170(D) above, the dwelling and the accessory structures do not embody elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural innovation. While the dwelling utilizes Neo-Mediterranean style architectural elements, they are simple and modest in design and the dwelling does not have unique features that distinguish this property from other Neo-Mediterranean style homes. The home would not be considered to have elements of architectural design that represent a significant architectural innovation.

RMC Section 2.62.170(G): It has a unique location or singular physical characteristics representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the city.

The property is located at 520 Ruiz Street which is on the east side of Ruiz Street approximately 70 feet south of West High Avenue. At the time the dwelling was constructed, historic aerial images indicate that this property was surrounded by single-family residences in all directions. The surrounding characteristics of the neighborhood have changed over the years as a few surrounding properties have become vacant. The single-family residences to the east and north and vacant lots to the west and south. The property is not located within a unique location and the structure is not a familiar visual feature of the neighborhood, community, or city. The surrounding properties are as follows:

	General Plan	Zoning	Land Use
North:	Transit Village	Transit Villages Specific Plan – Village Center (TVSP/VC)	Single-family residential
South:	Transit Village	Transit Villages Specific Plan – Village Center (TVSP/VC)	Single-family residential

RMC Section 2.62.170(K): It is located within a historic and scenic or urban conservation district, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development.

Refer to the response under 2.62.170(J) above. The site is not located within any historic district.

B) CEQA Criteria for Significance

In addition to the City of Redlands criteria, California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 (Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) also has findings for determining if a building has "Historic Significance." Each of those findings is identified within the Preliminary Environmental Checklist Form (Attachment C) with justification as to why this structure is not historically significant.

A. Associated with events have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California History and cultural heritage.

A thorough record search of local newspapers and City directories did not indicate that this property is associated with any specific events that may have contributed to California's history or cultural heritage.

B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

Please refer to the response provided under Section 2.62.170(C), above. The existing single-family residence and accessory structures are not associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.

Please refer to the response provided under Section 2.62.170(D), above. The structures do not embody distinctive characteristics of any type, period, region, or method of construction, nor does it represent the work of an important creative individual, nor possess high artistic values.

D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information in prehistory or history.

The buildings and site have not yielded any information regarding prehistory or history. Based on the review of the criteria above as it relates to the demolition of the structure, it is not historically significant, and approval of the proposed demolition will not cause a

substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

C) Conclusion of Analysis

Based on the listed criteria and their associated responses, staff has determined the single-family residence and accessory structures are not considered historically significant.

The Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission is authorized to determine the potential historical significance of the structures and the need for any further environmental review, and subsequently approve, condition, or deny the demolition permit application. If the Commission determines that the structures have no historical significance and the permit application is approved, the application is exempt from further review by the City unless an appeal is made to the City Council. If no appeal is filed within the time provided, the Development Services Department may issue the demolition permit in accordance with the Redlands Municipal Code.

If the Commission determines that the structures have historical significance, the Commission would then direct staff to conduct additional environmental review and subsequently approve, condition, or deny the application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission approve Demolition No. 383 based on the facts presented in this staff report and subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval.

MOTION

If the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission deems it appropriate, staff recommends the following motion:

“I move that the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission adopt Resolution No. 2023-13, to determine that Demolition Permit No. 383 is exempt from environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines and approve Demolition Permit No. 383 based on the facts within this staff report and subject to the Conditions of Approval.”



ATTACHMENT "A"

Location Map and Aerial Photograph



Project Site

This map was produced by the City of Redlands, Geographic Information System. The City of Redlands assumes no warranty or legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. The data used to generate this map is dynamic in nature, therefore the information shown may or may not be the most current.



May 16, 2023

OneStop.mxd

ATTACHMENT "B"

Site Photographs

West Elevation



East Elevation



North Elevation



South Elevation



Garage West Elevation



Garage North Elevation



Garage South Elevation



Garage East Elevation



Patio South Elevation



Patio East Elevation



Patio West Elevation



ATTACHMENT "C"

Preliminary Environmental Checklist

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: Demolition No. 383

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
City of Redlands
Development Services Department
35 Cajon Street, Suite 20
Redlands, CA 92373
Mailing Address:
City of Redlands
Development Services Dept. – Planning
P.O. Box 3005
Redlands, CA 92373

3. Contact Person: Jazmin Serrato, Junior Planner

4. Project Location: 520 Ruiz Street, Redlands, CA (Assessor Parcel Number: 0169-156-10-0000)

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:
DBSS Brockton, LLC
395 N. E Street, Suite 104
San Bernardino, CA 92401

6. General Plan Designation: Transit Village

7. Zoning Designation: Transit Villages Specific Plan – Village Center (TVSP/VC)

8. Description of Project: The applicant is proposing to demolish an approximately 1,570 square-foot single-family residence, an approximately 375 square-foot patio, and an approximately 950 square foot garage located at 520 Ruiz Street (APN: 0169-156-10-0000) within the Village Center (VC) District of the Transit Villages Specific Plan. This proposal may qualify for exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301(I) (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines.

9. Existing On-site Land Use and Setting: The subject property is currently developed with a single-family residential dwelling, a rear patio, and a detached garage. The surrounding properties are as follow:

	General Plan	Zoning	Land Use
North:	Transit Village	Transit Villages Specific Plan – Village Center (TVSP/VC)	Single-family residential
South:	Transit Village	Transit Villages Specific Plan – Village Center (TVSP/VC)	Single-family residential
West:	Transit Village	Transit Villages Specific Plan – Village Center (TVSP/VC)	Single-family residential
East:	Transit Village	Transit Villages Specific Plan – Village Center (TVSP/VC)	Single-family residential

The site is not located within any registered Historic and Scenic Districts and is not listed as a designated historic resource.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): None.
11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Not Applicable. This Preliminary Environmental Checklist is being prepared in compliance with Section 15.44.060 of the City of Redlands Municipal Code to confirm exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act, through Section 15301 (Existing Facilities).


ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

- On the basis of this initial study, the City of Redlands, as Lead Agency, finds that the proposed structure(s) to be demolished are not a Historical Resource and has no historical significance, as defined in Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, and Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code. Consequently, the demolition of the structure(s) is considered to be ministerial and exempt from the preparation of a Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report, pursuant to the Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines, and the City’s Municipal Code. Further, this initial study has been prepared in accordance with Section 15.44.060 of the Redlands Municipal Code which requires an initial study be prepared for all demolition permit applications involving structures over fifty (50) years old.



Jazmin Serrato, Junior Planner
 City of Redlands
 May 15, 2023

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all determinations, except "No Impact" determinations that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" determination 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" determination 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 determinations and discussion 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 potentially significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries in any section of this Initial Study, then an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared to fully analyze the identified issue(s).
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," 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 (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In such cases, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analyses 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 any effects that are determined to be "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 any and all references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., General Plan maps or exhibits, zoning ordinances, specific plans, etc.). Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion. In this Initial Study, a References section is provided at the end of the document.
- 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.

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

Aesthetics – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway. The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residential dwelling, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure which are not located within a scenic vista or along a scenic highway.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not damage scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The property is not located along a state scenic highway and the building itself is not historic. The property primarily consists of grass, shrubs and vegetation, and there is no known rock outcropping on-site.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not degrade the existing visual character or affect the quality of the site and its surroundings. The demolition of the dwelling would not create a change in the appearance of the surroundings. Overall, the demolition of the dwelling and detached structures will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the area.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Lighting and glare would be reduced as a result of the demolition of the structures onsite.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>II. AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.</p>	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>
<p>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)?</p>	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>
<p>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>
<p>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?</p>	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>

Agriculture & Forest Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The project includes the demolition of an approximately 1,570 square-foot single-family residence, an approximately 375 square-foot patio, and an approximately 950 square foot garage. The property does not include any Prime Farmland; therefore, the demolition will not convert Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.
- b) *No Impact.* The demolition will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. The property is within the Village Center (VC) District of the Transit Villages Specific Plan. The demolition does not include any proposal to change the zoning district nor is the property under the Williamson Act contract.
- c) *No Impact.* This demolition is located in an area that is zoned for transit-oriented development, as allowed by the underlying zoning district. The property does not contain any 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 such, removal of the structures on the property will not create an impact on forest land or timberland.
- d) *No Impact.* The demolition will not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use, as the property does not contain any forest land or propose the conversion of any forest land to non-forest use.
- e) *No Impact.* This demolition is located in an area that is surrounded by development. There are currently no agriculture uses that exist onsite or immediately adjacent to the site. The site contains a single-family residence, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure. Therefore, no impacts will occur related to agriculture or forest resources.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY.				
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Air Quality – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not 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.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures.
- e) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
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 & Wildlife or U.S. Fish & 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 & Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? – Since Kangaroo rats are endangered in Redlands how can we determine they are not on this specific site? I checked the CA Dept of Fish and Wildlife Service map online and they only indicate that Kangaroo Rats are endangered in the general Redlands area.	—	—	—	✓
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?	—	—	—	✓

Biological Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The property is located within an urbanized area and the project scope includes the demolition of the existing structures on a developed residential parcel for future development that

is yet to be determined. This demolition will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications. All work completed will be required to adhere to all local, State, and Federal laws.

- b) *No Impact.* There are no riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities within the project area and no disturbance beyond the limits of the subject property is proposed.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not 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. No protected wetlands exist within the subject property.
- d) *No Impact.* The project includes the demolition of an existing single-family residential dwelling, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure that have been previously developed and will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native residential 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) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. There are currently no trees present on the property. Any removal of the trees is required to be done in compliance with all local, State, and Federal laws.
- f) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Cultural Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The historical significance of the project has been reviewed pursuant to the findings of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852) which are as follow.

A. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California History and cultural heritage.

A thorough record search of local newspapers and City directories did not indicate that this property is associated with any specific events that may have contributed to California’s history or cultural heritage.

B. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past.

Staff conducted research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through newspaper.com. The corresponding building permit records and Sanborn maps indicate the property was previously addressed 520 Second Street and it appeared as such within the directories. The property first appeared in the directories in 1954. The table (shown below) lists the residents associated with the subject property based on the information obtained from the City Directories located at the A.K. Smiley Library’s Heritage Room and the San Bernardino County Assessor’s Records.

Directory Year	Name(s)	Occupation	Additional Information
1950	Kronage, George H.	Occupation not listed on building permit.	The owner built main dwelling and garage.
1954	Garcia, Violette Hazel	Housewife Husband not listed.	First directory where 520 Second Street was found.
1958 – 2003	Lopez, Isabelo C Lopez, Trinidad T	Caster employee at Universal Rundle Occupation not listed.	Building permits show him as the owner in 1959.
2022 – Present	DBSS Brockton LLC	Not listed.	Listed on San Bernardino County Assessors since 12/29/2022.

Newspapers from the Redlands Daily facts from June 5, 1959, indicate the subject property was a part of Tract No. 3632. These developments included 28 single-family residences owned and developed by George H. Kronage. No information was found regarding the first owner listed in the directories, Violette Hazel Garcia. Newspapers from 1960 to 1974, indicate Isabelo Lopez was a member of Philip Marmolego Post No. 650 of the American Legion Post who became commander from 1966 to 1967. His wife, Trinidad Lopez, was an involved member of St. Mary’s Church and Mariposa’s Elementary Parent Teacher’s Association. The individuals associated with the subject property were involved members of their community, but newspapers do not indicate them as important figures. The individuals that were associated to the subject property had working class occupations and are not known to have significantly contributed to the culture, history, or development of the city.

Based on the research of public records conducted by staff and through local and regional newspaper database searches, staff was not able to identify any important persons associated with the property. The newspaper research revealed no significant information related to the building or tenants that occupied the building. Staff has determined that the individuals associated with the dwelling are not associated with significant individuals from the past.

C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.

A local and regional newspaper records database search was conducted for the subject site. The city's building permits for the main residence and original garage list George H. Kronage as the owner and contractor and do not list a builder or architect. Building permits also indicate the builder and owner of the detached rear patio and garage addition was Isabelo Lopez. There is no evidence of these contractors being master builders. Given the simplicity of the residential building, and limited amount of information discovered researching the property, staff assumes that the building is not the notable work of an architect or master builder.

The 1,570 square-foot single family residence resembles a Neo-Mediterranean design of the Spanish Eclectic variety featuring stucco walls and three rounded arches at the front façade, and a low-pitched gable roof. The front façade of the dwelling also features two windows with aluminum patio covers and the main entry incorporates three steps of stairs leading to a front porch area including a door entry and a large front window. The lower portion of the main entry also features a brick design. At the rear portion of the residence there is a detached patio structure and a detached garage. The detached patio structure, approximately 375 square-feet in size, is a wooden addition combined with supporting pillars of concrete masonry blocks, some of which feature decorative elements at the front façade. The detached garage, approximately 950 square-feet in size, features stucco walls and a low pitch gabled roof similar to the main dwelling at the southern portion and the northern portion consists of a wooden carport addition. The dwelling and accessory structures have a simple design, and their Neo-Mediterranean elements are modest and understated. Both the residence and detached structures have a simplistic design and do not possess high artistic values or have distinctive characteristics.

D. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information in prehistory or history.

The building and site have not yielded any information regarding prehistory or history. Based on the review of the criteria above as it relates to the demolition of the structure, the structure is not historically significant, and approval of the proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

- b) *No Impact.* The building and site have not yielded any information regarding prehistory or history. The building will not likely yield information about the past. Therefore, approval of the proposed project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature as ground disturbance is not proposed.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS.				
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 42.	—	—	—	✓
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	—	—	—	✓
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	—	—	—	✓
iv) Landslides?	—	—	—	✓
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	—	—	—	✓
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	—	—	—	✓
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	—	—	—	✓
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	—	—	—	✓

Geology & Soils – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: Rupture of a known earthquake fault; Strong seismic ground shaking; Seismic-related ground failure, including

liquefaction; and landslides.

- b) *No Impact.* Disturbance within the project site will be limited to the immediate location surrounding the single-family residence and the site is not being cleared or graded as a result of this project. The proposed project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- c) *No Impact.* Based on General Plan 2035 EIR Figures 3.6-1-4, the site is not 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.
- d) *No Impact.* Adoption of the proposed project is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property.
- e) *No Impact.* The proposed project does not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater. Existing sewer lines are located directly across the property operating through the middle of Ruiz Street. In addition, the scope of the project involves demolishing the structure on-site and does not include the need for septic tanks.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Greenhouse Gas Emissions – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not generate gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:				

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Hazards & Hazardous Materials – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, a demolition application shall be submitted to the City of Redlands Building and Safety Division for approval per the regulations set forth in the California

Building Code. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.

- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not 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. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest public school is Orangewood High School which is approximately 0.6 miles away from the subject property. The demolition process will be required to comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. This was verified through the Envirostor and GeoTracker database, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- e, f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a residential dwelling, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure which is not located within the immediate vicinity of a public or private airstrip. The project is located approximately 4.1 miles southwest of the Redlands Municipal Airport and approximately 8 miles southeast from the San Bernardino International Airport. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. The project is not located in an airport land use plan.
- g) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of small structures within a developed residential lot and it will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- h) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not 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.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY.				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Hydrology & Water Quality – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of an existing single-family residence, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure. No discharge will be created due to the removal of the structures onsite. The proposed project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

- b) *No Impact.* The project consists of demolishing a single-family residence, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure and is not expected to utilize groundwater supplies. The proposed project will not 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.
- c) *No Impact.* The project is the demolition of a residential dwelling, a detached carport, and a detached accessory structure. The proposed project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or offsite.
- d-f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is a demolition and will remove impervious surface area from the site. This should result in a reduction in the amount of runoff from the site. The proposed project will not create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.
- g-h) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a residential dwelling, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure and does not currently propose any new development. The proposed project will not place structures 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. The proposed project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.
- i-j) *No Impact.* The project is not located in an area subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impact will occur.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. LAND USE & PLANNING. Would the project:				
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?	—	—	—	✓

Land Use & Planning – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will remove existing structures from the site but will not

change the property boundaries or zoning and will not create any new division that would physically divide an established neighborhood or community.

- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with the zoning ordinance or general plan or other applicable land use plan as it only consists of the demolition and removal of a single-family residence, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition of a single-family residence, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure does not conflict with any conservation or natural community plan as it is located in an urban area.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. MINERAL RESOURCES.				
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Mineral Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The removal of the structures on-site will not change the availability of mineral resources and the project is not located near a mineral resource recovery area. No impact will occur related to these issues.
- b) *No Impact.* The removal of the structures will not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral source as delineated on a local general plan, or specific plan.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE. Would the project:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Noise – Discussion

- a, b) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition of a residential dwelling, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure will not result in exposure of persons to generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. The proposed project will not result in exposure of persons to, or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels.
- c, d) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition of a residential dwelling, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure will not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Demolition activities associated with the proposed project may temporarily increase noise levels in the immediate vicinity; however, noise levels are not anticipated to be substantial. All demolition activities associated with the project are required to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance and therefore, no impact would occur.
- e) *No Impact.* The project is not located within two miles of a public airport and is not located within an airport land use plan. The project is located approximately 4.1 miles southwest of the Redlands Municipal Airport. The proposed project is a demolition of a residential dwelling, a detached garage, and a detached accessory structure. This demolition would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels within the vicinity of an airport.
- f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residence, a detached garage, and a detached patio. This demolition would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. POPULATION & HOUSING.				
Would the project:				
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 road or other infrastructure)?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Population & Housing – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a residential structure. No extension of infrastructure is proposed by this project and no population growth is anticipated.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residential structure. The demolition would not result in the displacement of substantial amounts of existing housing or require additional housing to be constructed elsewhere.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not result in the displacement of a substantial number of people that would require the construction of replacement housing as it is currently a one single-family dwelling.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES.				
Would the project:				
a) 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:				
i) Fire protection?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii) Police protection?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
iii) Schools?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
iv) Parks?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
v) Other public facilities?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Public Services – Discussion

- a) The proposed project is not expected to impact or result in a need for new or altered public services provided by the City of Redlands, the Redlands Unified School District, or other government agencies. Police and fire protection for the project site are provided by the City of Redlands. The proposed project will not result in the need for new or additional public facilities such as public libraries or meeting facilities. The project will not induce significant residential growth requiring additional school facilities, nor will it directly generate the need for new additional park land. In terms of cumulative effects, the proposed project would not create any public services or facilities issues beyond that anticipated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, no impacts will occur related to these issues.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XV. RECREATION.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----------|
| a) 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? | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |

Recreation – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a residential structure, a detached garage, and a detached patio. The removal of the structure on this site will not contribute to an increased demand for recreational facilities.
- b) *No Impact.* The project will not affect existing or planned recreational facilities, nor create a significant new demand for additional recreational facilities.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC.

Would the project:

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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) 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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Transportation & Traffic – Discussion

- a-f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a residential structure and accessory structures. The removal of these structures would not create additional vehicle trips, or result in changes to vehicle circulation patterns, emergency access, and transit facilities. The demolition of the existing structures will not conflict with congestion on any major roads or highways or conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of circulation systems.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	-----------

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES.

Would the project:

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or,				
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Tribal Cultural Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The subject site was initially developed with a single-family residence, a detached garage, and a detached patio, which are proposed for demolition. No subsurface activities will occur as a result of the demolition of the structures on-site, beyond the removal of slabs and foundations. Grading of the site is not proposed in the scope of this demolition.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------	-----------

XVIII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS.

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Utilities & Service Systems – Discussion

- a, b) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single-family residential structure and accessory structures and will not generate any wastewater or result in the construction of new water or wastewater facilities.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities which could cause significant environmental effects.
- d) *No Impact.* The removal of the structure will decrease the water usage of the property. The demolition project will have no impact on water supplies available. The proposed project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the needs of the demolition process.
- e) *No Impact.* The demolition project includes the removal of a single-family dwelling and accessory structures. As such, the removal of the dwelling would not result in a need for additional capacity by the wastewater treatment provider (City of Redlands). Any future development of the property will require to be reviewed to confirm that adequate capacity exists for the desired development. Future connection to sewer, as needed for any future development could be provided.

f, g) *No Impact.* The proposed project will be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XXI. 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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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.)	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Mandatory Findings of Significance – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not 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) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

REFERENCES

1. City of Redlands (2017, December 5). *City of Redlands 2035 General Plan*. Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/planning-division-general-plan>
2. City of Redlands (2017, July 21). *City of Redlands General Plan Update and Climate Action Plan Environmental Impact Report (SCH No. 2016081041)*. Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/planning-division-general-plan>
3. San Bernardino County Assessor Records, "Property Information Management System." February 2023. Available online at: <http://www.sbcounty.gov/assessor/pims/PIMSINTERFACE.ASPX>
4. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. "National Wetlands Inventory." 8 March 2021. <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>
5. California Department of Conservation. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Available online at: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>
6. California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *EnviroStor Database*. Available online at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
7. California Department of Transportation. *California Scenic Highway Mapping System*. Available online at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/
8. City of Redlands (2017, December 5). *City of Redlands Climate Action Plan*. Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/planning-division-general-plan>
9. Historic Aerials. Available online at: <https://historicaerials.com/>
10. California State Geoportal. "California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer." 2020. Available online at: <https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414>
11. Department of Toxic Substances Control. "Envirostor." Available online at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Redlands>
12. State Water Resources Control Board. "Geotracker." Available online at: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0607100096
13. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. "National Wetlands Inventory." Available online at: <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>
14. City of Redlands, *City of Redlands List of Historic Resources (2022, April 20)*. Available online at: https://www.cityofredlands.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/designated_historic_resources_4-20-2022.pdf?1670369273

ATTACHMENT "D"

Resolution No. 2023-13 with Exhibit A (Conditions of Approval)

RESOLUTION NO. 2023-13

A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDLANDS APPROVING DEMOLITION NO. 383, TO DEMOLISH AN APPROXIMATELY 1,570 SQUARE-FOOT SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE, AN APPROXIMATELY 375 SQUARE-FOOT PATIO, AND AN APPROXIMATELY 950 SQUARE-FOOT DETACHED GARAGE OVER 50 YEARS OF AGE, LOCATED AT 520 RUIZ STREET WITHIN THE VILLAGE CENTER (VC) DISTRICT OF THE TRANSIT VILLAGES SPECIFIC PLAN (APN: 0169-156-10-0000).

WHEREAS, the applicant, DBSS Brockton LLC, has submitted an application for Demolition No. 383 to demolish an approximately 1,570 square-foot single-family residence, an approximately 375 square-foot patio, and an approximately 950 square foot detached garage located at 520 Ruiz Street (APN: 0169-156-10-0000) within the Village Center (VC) District of the Transit Villages Specific Plan; and,

WHEREAS, notice of this Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission public hearing was provided in accordance with Redlands Municipal Code Section 15.44; and,

WHEREAS, on June 1, 2023, the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission held a public hearing and considered the staff report, oral report, the testimony, and the written evidence submitted by and on behalf of the applicant and by members of the public; and,

WHEREAS, Public Resources Code Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) provides for exemption the California Environmental Quality Act, and the project qualifies for this exemption; and,

WHEREAS, following the public hearing for the Demolition, the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission determined that the structure does not have historical significance and is exempt from the preparation of a negative declaration or environmental impact report under the California Environmental Quality Act.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission of the City of Redlands as follows:

Section 1. The proposed project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301(I) (Existing Facilities), and there is no substantial evidence of any potentially significant impacts.

Section 2. The proposed demolition is hereby approved subject to the conditions of approval contained in Exhibit A attached to this Resolution.

Section 3. This Resolution shall become effective upon adoption and will be subject to a ten (10) day appeal period.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 1st day of June, 2023.

Kurt Heidelberg, Historic and Scenic
Preservation Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Linda McCasland, Secretary

I, Linda McCasland, Secretary to the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission of the City of Redlands, hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission at a regular meeting thereof held on the 1st day of June, 2023.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

Linda McCasland, Historic and
Scenic Preservation Commission
Secretary

EXHIBIT A
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
DEMOLITION NO. 383

1. This approval is to demolish an approximately 1,570 square-foot single-family residence, an approximately 375 square-foot patio, and an approximately 950 square foot detached garage located at 520 Ruiz Street (APN: 0169-156-10-0000) within the Village Center (VC) District of the Transit Villages Specific Plan.
2. Prior to demolition, a building permit shall be obtained from the Development Services Department.
3. The issuance of any permits shall comply with all provisions of the Redlands Municipal Code, including Section 15.44 which regulates the demolition of structures.
4. Unless demolition has commenced pursuant to a building permit, this application shall expire eighteen (18) months from the approval date.
5. All demolition activities shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday and prohibited on Sundays and Federal Holidays.
6. The applicant for this permit, and its successors and assigns, shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of Redlands, and its elected officials, officers, agents and employees, from and against any and all claims, actions, and proceedings to attack, set aside, void or annul the approval of this permit by the City, or brought against the City due to acts or omissions in any way connected to the applicant's project that is the subject of this permit. This indemnification shall include, but not be limited to, damages, fees, costs, liabilities, and expenses incurred in such actions or proceedings, including damages for the injury to property or persons, including death of a person, and any award of attorneys' fees. In the event any such action is commenced to attack, set aside, void or annul all, or any, provisions of this permit, or is commenced for any other reason against the City for acts or omissions relating to the applicant's project, within fourteen (14) City business days of the same, the applicant shall file with the City a performance bond or irrevocable letter of credit (together, the "Security") in a form and in an amount satisfactory to the City, to ensure applicant's performance of its defense and indemnity obligations under this condition. The failure of the applicant to provide the Security shall be deemed an express acknowledgement and agreement by the applicant that the City shall have the authority and right, without objection by the applicant, to revoke all entitlements granted for the project pursuant to this permit. The City shall have no liability to the applicant for the exercise of City's right to revoke this permit.