

REQUEST FOR HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ACTION

VI.B. REDLANDS COMMUNITY HOSPITAL, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER: SEAN REILLY)

PUBLIC HEARING to consider **Demolition No. 349** to demolish an existing single family residence that is approximately 2,235 square-feet and a 440 square foot detached garage. The structure is over 50 years of age (Built in 1959) and is located at 480 Terracina Blvd within the Suburban Residential (R-S) District (APN: 0172-141-07-0000). This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301 (L)(1) (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA guidelines.

HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION MEETING: March 4, 2021

Planner: Sean Reilly, Senior Planner

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, by the City of Redlands, the State of California, or the United States Government.
2. Existing Land Use: Zoning: Suburban Residential (R-S)
General Plan: Resource Preservation
3. Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission submittal dates
 - (A) Date Submitted: December 14, 2020
 - (B) Date Deemed Complete: February 10, 2021
 - (B) Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission Meeting: March 4, 2021

4. Attachments: (A) Location Map
(B) Aerial Photo
(C) Site Photos
(D) Preliminary Environmental Checklist
(E) Resolution No. 2021-04

BACKGROUND/ PROPOSAL

On December 14, 2020, the property owner, Redlands Community Hospital, submitted an application to demolish a single family dwelling and associated detached garage located at 480 Terracina Boulevard. The house is approximately 2,235 square-feet and the detached garage located to the rear of the home on the northwest side is approximately 440 square feet. Both of these structures are over 50 years old. These structures would be removed from the property as a part of this demolition application.

SUMMARY

Information from the City building permit records and County Assessor's office show that the home and garage were constructed in 1959. The buildings on the property are not designated historic resources but will require review by the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission in accordance with Redlands Municipal Section 15.44.070 for the demolition of a structure of fifty (50) years of age.

The structure appears in aerial photographs available back to 1960. The aerial photos show the home and the garage as well as a residence to the south and vacant lot to the north. Modifications appear to have been made to the home over time including the addition new windows, doors, two additions and solar panels have been added to the roof on the south side. The home has a simple gable roof with a composition shingle roof and a decorative fascia board on the front elevation. The rest of the home lacks this decorative fascia and instead exposed rafter tails are visible.

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 dwelling 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. 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.

Local Criteria for Significance

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.

Response: Aerials from the 1959 show the building present on the property. Aerial images from 1959 to the present correspond to the current placement of the existing building. The home is a simple single story ranch style design with stucco walls and a composition shingle roof and it is the original building associated with the subject property. The home's style and character are common within the City and would not be characterized as having significant interest or value.

A comprehensive newspaper search and research conducted at the A.K. Smiley Library's Heritage Room did not reveal any evidence that this specific structure makes a significant contribution to the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, State, or Country.

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

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

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.

Response: Staff conducted research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through newspapers.com. 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 persons who significantly contributed to the culture, history or development of the city associated with this building.

Permit records indicate that the home was built in 1959. At that time the owner was Bryant Smith, who is listed in the newspapers as a Redlands businessman. Later that year, City directories and permit records indicate that the home became occupied by Ben and Betty Osbun. Ben Osbun was a bank teller at Bank of America and the Osbun's. In 1966 permit records show that the home is owned by Edward and Betty Caraway, Betty Caraway is listed as a Redlands Unified School District Teacher in the City Directories. County Assessor records then indicate that the home was transferred to the Gregory family in 1973, Linda Jane Hollenberg in 2015 and finally Redlands Community Hospital in 2020.

Research conducted through newspapers.com did not find any information of significance for these owners. Staff has determined that the structures to be demolished are not associated with significant events from the past.

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.

Response: The home represents a simple ranch style home and there are several similar examples within the City. There are limited distinguishing design characteristics and it would not be considered one of the few remaining of this type. The structure has few architectural

elements and includes simplistic material such as wood detail and a tiled gable roof with exposed rafters. There are plenty of more notable examples of residential architecture from this period in the City.

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.

Response: A local and regional newspaper records database search was conducted for the subject site. The building permit on file for the construction of the building lists the name of the contractor for the home as “Owner”, Bryant Smith. No other detail is provided. Given the simplicity of the residential building, and absence of information discovered researching the property, staff assumes that the building is not the notable work of an architect or master builder.

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

Response: As discussed under Section 2.62.170.D above, the building is a common ranch style home and though it does have elements of ranch style architecture, it is comprised of basic materials and has been modified since its original construction. It does not embody any architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural innovation.

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.

Response: The property is located at 480 Terracina Boulevard. Currently, the property is surrounded homes on both the east and west side. Overall, the property is not located within a unique location and the structures are not considered familiar visual features of the neighborhood, community, or city. The surrounding properties are as follows:

	General Plan	Zoning	Land Use
North:	Resource Preservation	Suburban Residential (R-S)	Single Family Residence
South:	Resource Preservation	Suburban Residential (R-S)	Single Family Residence
West:	Resource Preservation	Estate Residential (R-A)	Single Family Residence
East:	Low Density Residential	Suburban Residential (R-S)	Single Family Residence

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

Section 2.62.170.H: It has unique design or detailing.

Response: The single story residence has little to no articulation throughout the elevations. The home was originally constructed with an “L” shape and has since been added onto since

its original construction to form more of a “T” shape. Additionally, while it does have some detailing on the front elevation, it appears to not to possess unique design or detailing that would be considered significant.

Section 2.62.170.I: It is a particularly good example of a period or style.

Response: As previously stated, the home is a simple, single-story ranch style home. The home has limited details and has alterations to the windows and doors. The architectural characteristics of the building do not embody significant distinctive features that represent a particularly good example of a period or style. The building incorporates simplistic design features for a single family residence and is not a particularly good example of ranch style homes especially given the number of other homes within the City which are intact and are much better examples.

Section 2.62.170.J: It contributes to the historical or scenic heritage or historical or scenic properties of the city (to include, but not be limited to, landscaping, light standards, trees, curbing, and signs).

Response: The building does not contribute in any way to historic or scenic properties within the City. The property is located adjacent other existing residences and is not surrounded by any scenic properties.

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.

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

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.”

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

Response: 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.

Response: Please refer to the response provided under Section 2.62.170.C, above. The 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.

Response: 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.

Response: 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 structures, they are not historically significant and approval of this demolition will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

Conclusion of Analysis

Based on the listed criteria and their associated responses, staff has determined the home is not considered historically significant and does not meet the criteria for historic designation.

The Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission is authorized to determine the potential historical significance of the structure and the need for any further environmental review, and subsequently approve, condition or deny the demolition permit application. If the Commission determines that the structure has no historical significance and the permit application is approved, the application is exempt from further review.

If the Commission determines that the structure has 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. 349 based on the facts presented in this staff report and subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval.

MOTION

“I move that the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission adopt Resolution No. 2021-03 approving Demolition Permit No. 349, based on the facts within this staff report and subject to the Conditions of Approval.”

Attachment A

Location Map



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.



February 26, 2021

OneStop.mxd

Attachment B



017221215
1635

460
017214115

470
017214111

480
017214107

490
017214108

500

017214113

017214114
510

017214102

1741

1721 017214116



017215201

421

452

TERRACINA BLVD

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.



February 23, 2021

OneStop.mxd

Attachment C



480 Terracina - East Elevation - Front



480 Terracina - East Elevation - Front - Aerial



480 Terracina - East Elevation #2 - Front



480 Terracina - North Elevation #1 - Side #1



480 Terracina - North Elevation #2- Side #2



480 Terracina - South Elevation - Side



480 Terracina - West Elevation - Rear



480 Terracina - West Elevation - Rear - Aerial

Attachment D

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: Demolition No. 349
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 & Telephone: Sean Reilly, Senior Planner, (909) 798-7555
4. Project Location: 480 Terracina Blvd, Redlands, CA (Assessor Parcel Number: 0172-141-07-0000-0000)
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:
Redlands Community Hospital
350 Terracina Blvd.
Redlands, Ca 92373
6. General Plan Designation: Resource Preservation
7. Zoning Designation: Suburban Residential (R-S)
8. Description of Project: The property owner, Redlands Community Hospital, proposes to demolish an existing single family residence that is approximately 2,235 square-foot and a 440 square foot detached garage. As a part of the project all of the structures would be removed from the property. The structure is over 50 years of age (Built in 1959) and is located at 480 Terracina Blvd within the Suburban Residential (R-S) District.
9. Existing On-site Land Use and Setting: The property is located on the west side of Terracina Blvd approximately 300 feet south of W. Fern Avenue. The property has been developed with a single family residence and a detached garage.
10. The surrounding properties are as follow:

	General Plan	Zoning	Land Use
North:	Resource Preservation	Suburban Residential (R-S)	Single Family Residence
South:	Resource Preservation	Suburban Residential (R-S)	Single Family Residence
West:	Resource Preservation	Estate Residential (R-A)	Single Family Residence
East:	Low Density Residential	Suburban Residential (R-S)	Single Family Residence

11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): None
12. 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 preliminary environmental checklist to be prepared for all demolition permit applications involving structures over fifty (50) years old.

Sean Reilly, Senior Planner
City of Redlands
February 8, 2021

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 residence and associated accessory structures 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. No scenic resources exist onsite, and there are no known rock outcroppings 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 single family residence and associated accessory structures would not create an adverse change in the appearance of the property or the surroundings. The removal of the structures on site would create a visual change but would not necessarily result in degradation in visual character of the site. Overall, the demolition would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the area.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Lighting and glare will be reduced as a result of the demolition of the structure 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>

- 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?

—

—

—

✓

Agriculture & Forest Resources – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The project includes the demolition of a single family residence and associated accessory structures. The property does not include Prime Farmland and 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 a residential zone and has been developed since 1959. 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 residential use and the property has not been used for agriculture in recent history. 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 surrounded by single family residences, the Redlands Community Hospital and an accessory parking area used for the hospital. There are no agriculturally zoned parcels in the immediate area of the project. 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>

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

Air Quality – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project 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 project will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project 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 project 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 project 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?

—	—	—	✓
---	---	---	---

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<u>Biological Resources – Discussion</u>				

- a) *No Impact.* The property is located within an urbanized area and the project scope is limited to the demolition of the existing structures. 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 residence, and related improvements 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. 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.

According to San Bernardino County Assessor and building permit records, the property was constructed in 1959. Based on permit history, research conducted through newspapers.com and at A.K. Smiley library, staff has determined that the building is not associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patters of California history and cultural heritage.

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

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 this building.

Research conducted by staff on newspaper.com, at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and in building permit records did not unveil any special importance of the occupants.

Permit records indicate that the home was built in 1959. At that time the owner was Bryant Smith. Later that year, City directories and permit records indicate that the home became occupied by Ben and Betty Osbun. Ben Osbun was a bank teller at Bank of America. In 1966 permit records show that the home is owned by Edward and Betty Caraway. Betty Caraway is listed as a Redlands Unified School District teacher in the City Directories. County Assessor records then indicate that the home was transferred to the Gregory family in 1973, Linda Jane Hollenberg in 2015 and finally Redlands Community Hospital in 2020.

Research conducted through newspapers.com did not find any information of significance for these owners. Staff has determined that the structures to be demolished are not associated with significant events 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.

The home is a single story with ranch style architecture constructed with a low pitched composition shingle roof with exposed rafters. There is a carport in the northern side of the home that is integrated in to the overall mass of the home. The exterior walls of the home are treated with stucco with wood panel accents on the east side and at the gable ends of the home. The original building permit for the home indicates that the structure was built to be 1,650 square feet with additions in 1966 and 2007. The garage structure is similar in style to the home. While the home is maintains some of the distinctive characteristics of a post war ranch style home, it has been modified with vinyl windows and solar has been added to the roof. There are several examples of this type of architecture located within the City of Redlands and many of those are of better quality. The home does not represent the work of an important creative individual or possess high artistic values and therefore, the demolition would not result in any impact related to this issue.

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

- c) *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.
- d) *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.	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
iv) Landslides?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

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 project and the site is not being graded as a result of this project. The proposed project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- 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 waste water. In addition, the scope of the project involves demolishing the structure on-site, and does not include the need for septic tanks or sewer systems.

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:				
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>

Issues:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With 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?	—	—	—	<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 Smiley Elementary School which is approximately 0.6 miles from the proposed project. 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 an no impact related to this issue would occur.
- 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 by 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 single family residence which is not located within the immediate vicinity of a public or private airstrip. 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 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 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)?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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 a single family residence. 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 and associated small accessory structures, 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, d) *No Impact.* The project is the demolition of a single family residence. The site will not be modified beyond the removal of the 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 or substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Further the
- e, 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 or otherwise degrade water quality.
- g, h) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single family residence and does not propose any new housing or structures. The proposed project will not 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. The proposed project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.
- i) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not 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) *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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) 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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

Land Use & Planning – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition would not create a physical division within an established community. The structures to be removed from the property are located on private property. All of the public improvements such as the sidewalk and roadway would remain in place and do physical division of a community would be created.
- 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 small structures.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition of the single family residence does not conflict with any conservation or natural community plan as it 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>
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>

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

Noise – Discussion

- a, b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. 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 project is the removal of a residential structure and it will not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise or a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. Project will be required to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance.

- e) *No Impact.* The project is located approximately 4.5 miles southwest of the Redlands Municipal Airport and approximately 4.0 miles south of the San Bernardino International Airport. The proposed project is a demolition of a single family residence. 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 and garage structure. 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 single family residence. 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 residence which has been vacant. The demolition would not result in the displacement of a significant amount of existing housing that would require replacement housing 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 a replacement housing as it is currently a vacant 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?	—	—	—	✓
ii) Police protection?	—	—	—	✓
iii) Schools?	—	—	—	✓
iv) Parks?	—	—	—	✓
v) Other public facilities?	—	—	—	✓

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 single family residence and accessory structures. The removal of these structures 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>
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?	—	—	—	<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>

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

Transportation & Traffic – Discussion

a-f) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a single family residence. 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 single family residence and accessory 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:

_____ _____ _____ ✓

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.

_____ _____ _____ ✓

Tribal Cultural Resources – Discussion

a) *No Impact.* The subject site was initially developed as a single family residence and accessory structures, 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 construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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>

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

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

Utilities & Service Systems – Discussion

- a) *No Impact.* The demolition of the single family residence will not result in an increase in waste water treatment because no new building is being constructed that would require waste water treatment.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facility which could cause significant environmental effects as it is the demolition of a single family residence.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not require the construction of storm water drainage facilities which could cause significant environmental effects as it is the demolition of an existing single family residence.
- d) *No Impact.* The project is a demolition and no new water supplies will be required. The proposed project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, no new or expanded entitlements needed.
- e) *No Impact.* The project is a demolition that will remove a single family structure and does not include any future connection to wastewater services. The proposed project will not 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, 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.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

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. The proposed demolition of the property at 480 Terracina Boulevard would be likely to closely coincide with the proposed demolition of three neighboring single family dwellings located on Terracina Boulevard. These demolitions will be conducted in a similar manner as the proposed demolition of 480 Terracina Boulevard. The planned demolition dates may overlap. However, due to the limited size and scope of the proposed demolitions, it is not anticipated that impacts would be 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

- Redlands General Plan
- City of Redlands Municipal Code
- San Bernardino County Assessor Records
- California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines

Attachment E

RESOLUTION NO. 2021-03

A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDLANDS APPROVING DEMOLITION NO. 349, TO DEMOLISH AN APPROXIMATELY 2,190 SQUARE FOOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE OVER 50 YEARS OF AGE AND DETACHED GARAGE, LOCATED AT 480 TERRACINA BLVD WITHIN THE SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL (R-S) DISTRICT (APN: 0172-141-07-0000)

WHEREAS, Jon Roberts, on behalf of Redlands Community Hospital, has submitted an application for Demolition No. 349 to demolish an approximately 2,190 square-foot single family residence over 50 years of age and accessory garage structure, located at 480 Terracina Blvd. within the Residential Suburban (R-S) District (APN: 0172-141-07-0000).

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 March 4, 2021 , 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 exemptions; 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 (L) (1) (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 day appeal period.

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED this 4th day of March, 2021.

Kurt Heidelberg, Historic and Scenic
Preservation Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Linda McCasland, Secretary

I, Linda McCasland, Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission Secretary 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 4th day of March, 2020

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

Linda McCasland, Historic and
Scenic Preservation Commission
Secretary

**EXHIBIT A
DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT
PLANNING DIVISION**

**CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR
DEMOLITION NO. 349**

Date of Preparation:	February 4, 2021
Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission Date:	March 4, 2021
Applicant:	Redlands Community Hospital
Location:	480 Terracina Blvd

1. This approval is to demolish an approximately 2,190 square foot single family residence over 50 years of age and detached garage structure, located at 480 Terracina in the Suburban Residential (R-S) District (APN: 0172-141-07-0000).
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, or a time extension is granted in accordance with Code, this application shall expire in eighteen (18) months from the approval date.
5. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, the applicant shall submit photos documenting the structures to the Heritage Room at the A.K. Smiley Library. Photos shall be high resolution digital files, which are not artificially resized or modified by photo editing software. Photos shall capture all elevations and relevant architectural details when present. A high resolution photo shall be considered 12-18MB at time of capture, uncompressed.
6. 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.
7. 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.

End of Conditions