

REQUEST FOR HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ACTION

V.A. JASMIN HANCOCK, APPLICANT (PROJECT PLANNER: ROSEMARY MONTOYA)

PUBLIC HEARING to consider **Demolition No. 394** – A request to demolish an approximately 360 square-foot detached accessory structure over 50 years of age located at 1051 Walnut Ave (APN: 0175-053-20-0000). This proposal may qualify for exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301(l)(4) (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines.

HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION MEETING: DECEMBER 5, 2024

Planner: Rosemary Montoya, Assistant Planner

Reviewed by: Sean Reilly, Principal 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 main residence and accessory structure are not individually designated as historic resources. However, records indicate they date back to 1900 and 1908, respectively, making both structures over 50 years old.
2. Existing Land Use: Zoning: Residential-Suburban (R-S)
General Plan: Low Density Residential
3. Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission submittal dates:
 - A. Submittal Dates: October 3, 2024
 - B. Date Deemed Complete: October 16, 2024
 - C. Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission Meeting: December 5, 2024
4. Attachments:
 - A. Location Map & Aerial Photograph
 - B. Site Photographs

- C. Preliminary Environmental Checklist
- D. Resolution No. 2024-07

PROPOSAL

The applicant, Jasmin Hancock, is proposing to demolish an approximately 360 square-foot detached accessory structure located at 1051 Walnut Ave (see Attachments A and B) within the Suburban Residential (R-S) District. The structure is over 50 years of age. The applicant proposes to demolish the structure to create space to construct a new accessory dwelling unit and attached garage.

BACKGROUND

Photographs provided by the applicant show that the accessory structure is approximately 360 square feet, the structure serves as an office. Staff was not able to locate the original building permits for the construction the structure. The 1908 Sanborn map show the presence of a detached accessory structure with the same building footprint. Staff is not able to confirm when the original structure was constructed, but based on historical aerial images and Sanborn maps, the structure is over 50 years of age.

SUMMARY

San Bernardino County Assessor's Office records indicate that the main residence on the property was constructed in 1801. Historic aerials confirm the placement of the structure in the 1908 aerial image, and the City's Directories begin to list the individuals that were associated with the subject property in 1919. Based on historic aerial images, Sanborn maps, and the City's Directories associated with the subject property, the detached accessory structure is at least 50 years of age.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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 preliminary 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." Therefore, 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 consist 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 information or evidence that the accessory 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 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. 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.

According to the San Bernardino County Assessor's Office, the main dwelling was constructed in 1801. Sanborn maps from 1900 show the footprint of the main dwelling, and by 1908, the building footprint of the detached accessory structure is also depicted. The original building permits for the structure's construction were not found in the city's building permit history. However, the building permits on file for the property include the following:

PERMIT TYPE	YEAR ISSUED	WORK PROPOSED
Building Permit	September 1, 1932	Reroof
Plumbing Permit	May 4, 1955	Water Heater
Building Permit	September 29, 1964	Reroof
Building Permit	March 27, 1977	Gas Line
Building Permit	November 7, 1978	Pool and Spa
Electrical Permit	February 23, 1979	Electric Meter
Building Permit	June 15, 1979	Fencing
Building Permit	July 5, 1991	Reroof

Staff conducted additional research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through Newspapers.com. Information on these individuals is provided under Section 2.62.170(C) below. However, there is no substantial 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.

Research conducted by staff through local and regional newspaper database searches, building records, and ownership history, determined that the land on which the building stands is not the site of any significant historic event. No information was found linking this structure to such events.

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 Newspapers.com. City directories begin listing the subject property in 1910. The table below lists the residents associated with the primary dwelling based on information from the City Directories located in the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room.

DIRECTORY YEAR	NAME(S)	OCCUPATION	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
1919	Prendergast, Jeffrey J. Prendergast, Mary G.	Vice President and Treasurer of Gold Banner Association Occupation not listed	N/A
1921	Prendergast, Jeffrey J. Prendergast, Mary G.	Vice President and Treasurer of Gold Banner Association Occupation not listed	N/A
1923	Bartee, Alice C.	Occupation not listed	N/A
1925	Stell, J. Glenn Stell, Lalla M.	Chauffer Occupation not listed	N/A
1927	Frasier, Lee A. Frasier, Ida E.	Lab Technician Occupation not listed	N/A
1929	Frasier, Lee A. Frasier, Ida E.	Mechanic Occupation not listed	N/A
1931	McCarty, Jean Mrs.	Occupation not listed	N/A
1933	McCarty, Eugenia D. Mrs.	Occupation not listed	N/A

HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
DEMOLITION NO. 394
December 5th, 2024

1936	McCarty, Earle E. McCarty, Eugenia D.	Owner Orange Grower Occupation not listed	N/A
1939	McCarty, Earle E. McCarty, Eugenia D.	Assistant Vice President of Santa Fe Railway Occupation not listed	N/A
1941	Osdick, G. O. Osdick, Ruth A.	Dealer in Shell Agricultural Ammonia Occupation not listed	N/A
1947	Osdick, Garner O. Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, Priscilla J. McIver, Peter G.	Dealer in Shell Agricultural Ammonia Occupation not listed Student Lawyer	N/A
1950	Osdick, Garner O. Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, Priscilla J.	Agent for Shell Chemical Co. & Distributor of Agro- Phosphate Fertilizer Occupation not listed Student	N/A
1952	Osdick, Ruth A. Mrs. Osdick, James R.	Housewife/Owner Student	N/A
1954	Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, James R. Osdick, Priscilla J.	Student & Tupper Ware Sales Agent Student Stenographer	N/A
1958	Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, James R. Osdick, Priscilla J.	Psychiatric Technician at Patton State Hospital Student Stenographer at Patton State Hospital	N/A
1961	Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, James R.	Psychiatric Technician at Patton State Hospital Student	

HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
DEMOLITION NO. 394
December 5th, 2024

	Osdick, Priscilla J.	Stenographer at Patton State Hospital	
1965	Osdick, Ruth Mrs.	Owner Psychiatric Technician at Patton State Hospital	
	Osdick, Priscilla J.	Secretary for Bernard J. Voss	
1967	Osdick, Ruth Mrs.	Owner Psychiatric Technician at Patton State Hospital	
	Osdick, Priscilla J.	Secretary for Bernard J. Voss	
1974	Osdick, Ruth A.	Owner	Beginning of San Bernardino County Assessor's Record
	Osdick, G. O.	Owner	
1975	Osdick, Ruth A.	Owner	
1991	Snowball, Earl L.	Owner	
	Snowball, Florence Yvonne	Owner	
2016	Snowball, Florence Yvonne	Owner	
2021	Snowball, Florence Yvonne	Owner	
	Tripplett, Leslie	Tenant	
	Snowball, Brad	Tenant	
2022	Murray, Michele	Tenant	
	Buhler, Louis Alexander	Owner	
	Buhler, Lisa Maria		

The first recorded owners of the property at 1051 Walnut Avenue, according to the A.K. Smiley Library Directories, are the Prendergast family, listed in both the 1919 and 2021 issues. The Prendergasts were active members of their community and the state. Mr. Jeffrey J. Prendergast served on the Redlands City Council and Chamber of Commerce, held two terms in the State Assembly, was a member of the State Forestry Board, served as a Trustee of the A.K. Smiley Public Library, was one of Redlands' first planning commissioners, and was a water conservation leader as President and Manager of the Bear Valley Mutual Water Company. His wife, Mrs. Mary G. Prendergast, led the Indian Affairs Department of the Contemporary Club of Redlands, was a member of the American Association of University Women, served as secretary of the Redlands Chapter of the American Red Cross, and was vice president of the Parent-Teacher Association at McKinley Middle School.

Other residents also worked locally. According to newspapers and directories at the A.K. Smiley Library, Glenn J. Stell owned Stell's Automobile Service Station on Colton Avenue. Between 1920 and 1976, Earle D. McCarty served as Assistant General Manager of the western lines of the Santa Fe Depot, and in 1945, when he left Redlands to work for the Federal Office of Defense Transportation, he and his wife, Mrs. Eugenia D. McCarty were no longer living at the subject property.

The Osdick family lived at 1051 Walnut Avenue between 1941 and 1975. Garner O. Osdick worked as an agent for Shell Chemical Co. and distributed agro-phosphate fertilizer. His wife, Ruth A. Osdick, was a psychiatric technician at Patton State Hospital in Highland, CA, and their daughter, Priscilla Joanne Osdick, worked there as a stenographer. Their son, James R. Osdick, was listed as a student in the directories.

San Bernardino Assessor's office records list the Snowball family as owners beginning in 1991. Newspapers indicate that Mr. Earl L. Snowball served as a deputy police officer for the City of Yucaipa, while Mrs. Florence Yvonne Snowball's occupation is unlisted. There are no records of historical significance associated with the property during their residency.

Based on staff's research, the individuals mentioned above are associated with the main dwelling, not the accessory structure. Though residents such as the Pendergasts have made contributions to the culture, history, and development of the city, these contributions do not appear to be closely associated with this property and more specifically, they are not associated with this accessory structure.

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 subject property is located on the corner of Walnut Avenue and San Jacinto Street. The detached accessory structure is located on the San Jacinto Street side, on the southwest corner of the property. It has a simple design with composite shingle roofing, two cupola vents on the north and south elevations, black trim along the frame and front door, and black-trimmed diamond lattice windows on the north, west, and south sides. The exterior is primarily white wood shake siding. Based on photos provided by the applicant, the interior is unfinished, and it does not appear to have a foundation. The structure is visible from the public right-of-way and based on historic images and a lack of Building and Safety or Planning permits, it appears to have remained largely unchanged over time. Overall, this structure does not stand out as one of the few remaining examples in the city with distinctive architectural characteristics of this type.

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 search through local and regional newspaper databases and the city's building permits found no record of the main residence or the accessory building's exact construction year, designer, or builder. Given the structure's limited architectural features, it is unlikely to be the notable work of an architect or master builder who significantly influenced the city's development.

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

As discussed in Section 2.62.170(D), the structure does not embody design, details, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural innovation. The structure features composite shingle roofing, two cupola vents, black trim along the frame and front door, and black-trimmed diamond lattice windows. Overall, the design is not unique enough to distinguish this property from others in the city in terms of 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 structure is within the street-side yard of 1051 Walnut Ave. The 1908 Sanborn maps show that the property was originally surrounded by residences, and since then, the remaining vacant lots nearby have also been developed with residential dwellings. The property is not located in a unique setting, and the structure itself is not a familiar visual feature within the neighborhood, community, or city. The surrounding properties are as follows:

	GENERAL PLAN	ZONING	LAND USE
NORTH	Low Density Residential	Suburban Residential (R-S) District	Single-family, Residential
SOUTH	Low Density Residential	Suburban Residential (R-S) District	Single-family, Residential
WEST	Low Density Residential	Suburban Residential (R-S) District	Single-family, Residential
EAST	Low Density Residential	Suburban Residential (R-S) District	Single-family, Residential

The site is not designated as a historic resource or federally designated; however, the main residence and the structure are both over 50 years of age.

RMC Section 2.62.170(H): It has unique design or detailing.

The detached accessory structure has a simplistic design and is approximately 360 square feet in size. The exterior primarily consists of white wood shake siding with a black trim along the frame of the structure and composite shingle roofing. No permit records were found for construction or modifications to the structure. Its features are modest and do not represent unique design or detailing specific to the main residence. Its architectural elements are common and not distinctive to the overall design of the subject property.

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

The structure does not exhibit distinctive features that make it a particularly good example of a period or style. Originally built as a storage structure, it has since been used as an office and an ancillary building for the main single-family residence. Its simple features, such as the composite shingle roof and white wood shake siding, are common. The city has a wide variety of accessory structures that illustrate better examples of the period or style. The City's Historic Context Statement indicates that the bar of significance would be significantly higher for styles that are

more common throughout the City; therefore, the structure which has limited unique architectural features would not be considered a particular good example or one of the best examples of this style within Redlands.

RMC 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).

The property is not located in any historical or scenic district and the detached structure does not contribute to any grouping of historic or scenic properties within the city. The property's landscape includes a newly planted orange grove, grass, and trees of various sizes, which will remain unchanged. The driveway and curbs will also remain and there are no light standards, or signs on site that could be considered historically significant.

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 demolition of the accessory structure will not impact the visual character of the property. It will be replaced by an accessory dwelling unit that will visually enhance the property as seen from the public right-of-way.

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 search of local newspapers and City directories found no evidence that this property is associated with any events that contributed significantly to California's history or cultural heritage.

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

As noted in the response under Section 2.62.170(C), the detached accessory structure is not associated with the lives of historically significant individuals. The structure is believed to have been originally built as a storage structure, it has since been used as an office and an ancillary building for the main single-family residence.

- 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.*

Referencing the response under Section 2.62.170(D), the structure does not embody distinctive characteristics of a particular type, period, region, or construction method. Nor does it represent the work of an important creative individual or possess high artistic value.

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

The accessory structure has not yielded, nor is it likely to yield, any information of significance to prehistory or history. Based on the evaluation of the criteria above, the structure is not considered historically significant. Therefore, approving the proposed demolition of the accessory structure 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 corresponding responses, staff has determined that the detached accessory structure is likely not considered historically significant.

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 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 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. 394 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. 2024-07, to determine that Demolition Permit No. 394 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. 394 based on the facts within this staff report and subject to the Conditions of Approval.”

ATTACHMENT "A"

Location Map and Aerial Photograph



City of Redlands
Location Map

Author: Redlands GIS Date: 10/9/2024

ATTACHMENT "B"

Site Photographs

Louis Buhler
1051 Walnut Ave
Redlands, CA 92373

REDLANDS

OCT 03 2024

ONE STOP PERMIT CENTER



North View (Facing Walnut Ave)



South View (Facing Fence)



West View (Facing San Jacinto St)



East View (Facing Pool)

Louis Buhler
1051 Walnut Ave
Redlands, C 92373

Accessory Structure Interior





ATTACHMENT "C"

Preliminary Environmental Checklist

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: Demolition No. 394
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: Rosemary Montoya, Assistant Planner
4. Project Location: 1051 Walnut Ave., Redlands, CA 92373 (APN: 0175-053-20-0000)
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Jasmin Hancock, 1177 Idaho Street, Suite 200A, Redlands, CA 92374
6. General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential
7. Zoning Designation: Suburban Residential (R-S) District

Description of Project: The applicant is proposing to demolish an approximately 360 square-foot detached accessory structure over 50 years of age located at 1051 Walnut Ave (APN: 0175-053-20-0000) within the Suburban Residential (R-S) District. This proposal may qualify for exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301(l)(4) (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines.

8. Existing On-site Land Use and Setting: The property is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Walnut Avenue and San Jacinto Street. The site is currently improved with one main residence, and two accessory structures used for storage. The subject structure is located in the street side yard, on the southwest corner of the property. The subject property and the surrounding parcels are developed with residential uses as listed below.

	GENERAL PLAN	ZONING	LAND USE
NORTH	Low Density Residential	Suburban Residential (R-S) District	Single-family, Residential
SOUTH	Low Density Residential	Suburban Residential (R-S) District	Single-family, Residential
WEST	Low Density Residential	Suburban Residential (R-S) District	Single-family, Residential
EAST	Low Density Residential	Suburban Residential (R-S) District	Single-family, Residential

The main residence and accessory structure are not individually designated as historic resources. However, records indicate they date back to 1900 and 1908, respectively, making both structures over 50 years old.

- 9. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement): None.
- 10. 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 to be demolished is 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 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.

Rosemary Montoya, Assistant Planner
 City of Redlands
 December 5th, 2024

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 project is the demolition of an accessory structure that is not located within any scenic vista; therefore, no impact would occur.
- 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. The structure to be demolished will be an accessory structure, and there is no known rock outcropping on-site.
- c) *Less than significant Impact.* The proposed project will not degrade the existing visual character or diminish the quality of the site and its surroundings. Demolishing the accessory structure will not significantly alter the appearance of the area, as this is the only structure being removed, and the essential characteristics of the site will remain intact. The structure slated for demolition is not a focal point of the property; the detached accessory structure is located on the San Jacinto Street side, on the southwest corner of the property. Therefore, the demolition will result in a less than significant impact.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition 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 this structure as any lights attached to the structure would be removed at the time of demolition.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
II. AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES –				
<p>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 a 360 square-foot accessory structure. The property does not include any Prime Farmland and is located within the Urban and Built of Land zone by the Department of Conservation. Therefore, the demolition will not convert any existing Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. The property is within the Suburban Residential (R-S) District. The demolition does not include any proposal to change the zoning district nor is the property under the Williamson Act contract.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition is located in an area that is zoned for the development of residential uses. 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 nor is the project proposing the conversion of any forest land to non-forest use.
- e) *No Impact.* The detached accessory structure is located in the southwesterly street side yard of the existing residence. The 1908 Sanborn maps indicate that the property was surrounded by residences within the immediate vicinity. Since that time, the remaining vacant parcels have been developed with residential dwellings. The existing recently planted orange grove is located on the northern portion of the property, in front of the main dwelling, and the accessory structure is located in the rear portion. 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> |

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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. The project is a demolition to remove a detached accessory, which will comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures. Therefore, no impact will occur in relation to this issue.
- 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. Demolition activities associated with the proposed project may temporarily increase pollutant levels in the immediate vicinity; however, pollution levels are not anticipated to be substantial. All demolition activities associated with the project are required to comply with the Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures, no impact would occur.
- 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:				

ISSUES

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT NO IMPACT

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?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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.	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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>

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – DISCUSSION

- a) *No Impact.* The property is located within an urbanized area and the project is the demolition of an existing 360 square-foot accessory structure on a developed residential parcel. 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 a detached accessory structure. The existing site conditions will remain the same. The proposed project 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. No trees are proposed to be removed as a part of this application. Any removal of the trees is required to be done in compliance with all local, State, and Federal laws and compliance with existing regulations will ensure that no impact occurs in relation to this issue.
- 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.

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

Staff was unable to locate the original building permits for the accessory structure. However, the 1908 Sanborn map shows a detached accessory structure with the same building footprint. Based on research of local historical newspapers and building permits, the accessory structure is not linked to events of significant historical or cultural importance to California; it primarily functioned as a shed for additional storage.

ii. *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 table (shown below) lists the residents associated with the primary dwelling based on the information obtained from the City Directories located at the A.K. Smiley Library's Heritage Room.

DIRECTORY YEAR	NAME(S)	OCCUPATION	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
1919	Prendergast, Jeffrey J. Prendergast, Mary G.	Vice President and Treasurer of Gold Banner Association Occupation not listed	N/A
1921	Prendergast, Jeffrey J. Prendergast, Mary G.	Vice President and Treasurer of Gold Banner Association Occupation not listed	N/A
1923	Bartee, Alice C.	Occupation not listed	N/A
1925	Stell, J. Glenn Stell, Lalla M.	Chauffer Occupation not listed	N/A
1927	Frasier, Lee A. Frasier, Ida E.	Lab Technician Occupation not listed	N/A
1929	Frasier, Lee A. Frasier, Ida E.	Mechanic Occupation not listed	N/A
1931	McCarty, Jean Mrs.	Occupation not listed	N/A
1933	McCarty, Eugenia D. Mrs.	Occupation not listed	N/A
1936	McCarty, Earle E. McCarty, Eugenia D.	Owner Orange Grower Occupation not listed	N/A

1939	McCarty, Earle E. McCarty, Eugenia D.	Assistant Vice President of Santa Fe Railway Occupation not listed	N/A
1941	Osdick, G. O. Osdick, Ruth A.	Dealer in Shell Agricultural Ammonia Occupation not listed	N/A
1947	Osdick, Garner O. Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, Priscilla J. McIver, Peter G.	Dealer in Shell Agricultural Ammonia Occupation not listed Student Lawyer	N/A
1950	Osdick, Garner O. Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, Priscilla J.	Agent for Shell Chemical Co. & Distributor of Agro-Phosphate Fertilizer Occupation not listed Student	N/A
1952	Osdick, Ruth A. Mrs. Osdick, James R.	Housewife/Owner Student	N/A
1954	Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, James R. Osdick, Priscilla J.	Student & Tupper Ware Sales Agent Student Stenographer	N/A
1958	Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, James R. Osdick, Priscilla J.	Psychiatric Technician at Patton State Hospital Student Stenographer at Patton State Hospital	N/A
1961	Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, James R. Osdick, Priscilla J.	Psychiatric Technician at Patton State Hospital Student Stenographer at Patton State Hospital	
1965	Osdick, Ruth Mrs. Osdick, Priscilla J.	Owner Psychiatric Technician at Patton State Hospital Secretary for Bernard J.	

		Voss	
1967	Osdick, Ruth Mrs. Osdick, Priscilla J.	Owner Psychiatric Technician at Patton State Hospital Secretary for Bernard J. Voss	
1974	Osdick, Ruth A. Osdick, G. O.	Owner Owner	Beginning of San Bernardino County Assessor's Record
1975	Osdick, Ruth A.	Owner	
1991	Snowball, Earl L. Snowball, Florence Yvonne	Owner Owner	
2016	Snowball, Florence Yvonne	Owner	
2021	Snowball, Florence Yvonne Tripplett, Leslie Snowball, Brad Murray, Michele	Owner Tenant Tenant Tenant	
2022	Buhler, Louis Alexander Buhler, Lisa Maria	Owner	

One of the first recorded families to own the property, Jeffrey J. and Mary G. Prendergast, appears to have had the most significant community presence related to the history of the home. Mr. Jeffrey J. Prendergast was active in various community groups and organizations. He served on the Redlands City Council and the Chamber of Commerce, was a two-term member of the State Assembly, a member of the State Forestry Board, a Trustee of the A.K. Smiley Public Library, and one of Redlands' first planning commissioners. He dedicated much of his time to water conservation, serving as President and Manager of the Bear Valley Mutual Water Company. His wife, Mrs. Mary G. Prendergast, was also involved in local affairs. Historic Redlands Daily News articles indicate that she was a member of the American Association of University Women, secretary of the Redlands Chapter of the American Red Cross, vice president of the Parent-Teacher Association at McKinley Middle School, and head of the Indian Affairs Department for the Contemporary Club of Redlands. After the Prendergast family lived in the residence, the address was changed from 651 Walnut Ave to 1051 Walnut Ave.

Based on staff's research, the individuals mentioned above are associated with the main dwelling, not the accessory structure. Though residents such as the Pendergasts have made contributions to the culture, history, and development of the city, these contributions do not appear to be closely associated with this property and more specifically, they are not associated with this accessory structure.

- iii. *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 accessory building does not share the architectural style of the main dwelling and, according to the 1900 Sanborn maps, was not constructed at the same time. The structure has a simple design, featuring composite shingle roofing with two cupola vents on the north and south elevations. The exterior is primarily white wood shake siding with black trim along the frame and front door. The windows on the north, east, and west elevations are trimmed in black and feature a diamond lattice design. A white wooden door is visible on the eastern elevation. Based on photos provided by the applicant, the interior is unfinished and there does not appear to be a foundation. This detached accessory structure, approximately 360 square feet, is located in the rear side yard of the property.

Overall, the accessory structure has a modest design and does not represent the work of a notable creative individual, nor does it possess high artistic value or distinctive architectural characteristics.

- iv. *Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information in prehistory or history. The accessory structure has 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 structure has not yielded any information regarding prehistory or history. The structure 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.	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
iv. Landslides?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
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. The project is a demolition, which will remove a detached accessory structure that was not used as a living space from the property; therefore, no impact will occur in relation to this issue.
- b. *No Impact.* Disturbance within the project site will be limited to the immediate location surrounding the accessory structure 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, 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.* The proposed project is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994) and will not create 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. The scope of the project involves demolishing an existing accessory structure on-site and does not include the need for septic tanks. Existing sewer lines are located in Walnut Avenue. Any future project on this site would be required to connect to the existing sewer. No impact related to this issue would occur.

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-b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not generate gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment. The proposed project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The project is the demolition of a 360 square-foot accessory structure and therefore no impact would occur in relation to this issue.

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
VII. 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>

ISSUES:

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICAN T IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	--------------

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----------|
| 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 Cope Middle School which is approximately 0.8 miles 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 an accessory structure which is not located within the immediate vicinity of a public or private airstrip. The project is located approximately 5 miles southwest of the Redlands Municipal Airport and approximately 6.9 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 a detached accessory structure, and it will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project is the demolition of a 360 square-foot accessory structure and therefore no impact would occur in relation to this issue.
- 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. The project is the demolition of a 360 square-foot accessory structure and therefore no impact would occur in relation to this issue.

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	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

ISSUES:

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned 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 360 square foot 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 an existing 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, d) *No Impact.* The project is the demolition of 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.
- 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.

- g, h) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of an accessory structure. 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) *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 inundation by 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>
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?	—	—	—	<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 project will remove an existing structure 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 small structure.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition 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	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

MINERAL RESOURCES – DISCUSSION

a,b) *No Impacts.* The removal of the structure 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. The removal of the structure 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>

NOISE – DISCUSSION

- a, b) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition of an accessory structure 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 demolition of an 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 5 miles southwest of the Redlands Municipal Airport and approximately 6.9 miles southeast from the San Bernardino International Airport. The proposed project is a demolition of 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 small accessory structure which would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels from an airstrip.

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<hr/>				
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-f) *No Impacts.* The proposed project is the demolition of a detached accessory structure. No extension of infrastructure is proposed by this project and no population growth is anticipated. The structure to be demolished was not used as a living space, and no impact related to the displacement of people or housing would occur.

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>
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>
---	---	---	----------

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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 an accessory structure. The removal of the structure on this site will not contribute to an increased demand for recreational facilities.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not affect existing or planned recreational facilities, nor create a significant new demand for additional recreational facilities. No impact related to this issue would occur.

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>

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
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 an accessory structure. The removal of this structure would not create additional vehicle trips, or result in changes to vehicle circulation patterns, emergency access, and transit facilities. The demolition of the existing structure 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	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

ISSUES:

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

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

No Impact. The only structure to be demolished will be a detached accessory structure. 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> |

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	—	—	—	✓

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – DISCUSSION

- a, b) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a detached accessory structure and will not generate any wastewater or result in the construction of new water or wastewater facilities.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project is the demolition of a detached accessory structure and will not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities which could cause significant environmental effects.
- d) *No Impact.* 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 an accessory structure. As such, the removal of the structure would not result in a need for additional capacity by the wastewater treatment provider (City of Redlands). Any future development of the property will be required 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 is the demolition of an accessory structure. Trash service for the primary residence onsite is provided by the City of Redlands which operates its own public landfill which has adequate capacity to continue to service the site. The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste and no impact will occur in relation to this issue.

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? | — | — | — | ✓ |
|--|---|---|---|---|

ISSUES:

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----------|
| 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 is a demolition of a 360-square-foot accessory structure and will not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed project is a demolition of a 360-square-foot accessory structure and 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. San Bernardino County Assessor Records, "Property Information Management System." October 2024. Available online at: <http://www.sbcounty.gov/assessor/pims/PIMSINTERFACE.ASPX>
3. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. "National Wetlands Inventory." 16 October 2024. <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>
4. California Department of Conservation. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Available online at: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>
5. California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *EnviroStor Database*. Available online at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
6. California Department of Transportation. *California Scenic Highway Mapping System*. Available online at: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>
7. City of Redlands (2017, December 5). *City of Redlands Climate Action Plan*. Available online at: https://www.cityofredlands.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/final_redlands_cap_with_appendices_011718_0.pdf?1727749075
8. Historic Aerials. Available online at: <https://historicaerials.com/>
9. California State Geoportal. "California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer." 2020. Available online at: <https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414>
10. State Water Resources Control Board. "Geotracker." Available online at: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0607100096
11. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. "National Wetlands Inventory." Available online at: <https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/>
12. City of Redlands, *City of Redlands List of Historic Resources (2 November 2023)*. Available online at: https://www.cityofredlands.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/designated_historic_resources_11-02-2023.pdf?1698963146

ATTACHMENT "D"

Resolution No. 2024-07 (with Conditions of Approval)

RESOLUTION NO. 2024-07

A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDLANDS APPROVING DEMOLITION NO. 394, TO DEMOLISH A 360 SQUARE-FOOT DETACHED ACCESSORY STRUCTURE OVER 50 YEARS OF AGE, LOCATED AT 1051 WALNUT AVENUE (APN: 0175-053-20-0000).

WHEREAS, the applicant, Jasmin Hancock, has submitted an application for Demolition No. 394 to demolish an approximately 360 square-foot detached accessory structure located at 1051 Walnut Ave (APN: 0175-053-20-0000) within the Suburban Residential (R-S) District; 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 December 5th, 2024 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(l) (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 FIFTH DAY OF DECEMBER 2024.

Kurt Heidelberg, Historic and Scenic
Preservation Commission Chair

ATTEST:

Sonya Flint, Secretary

I, Sonya Flint, 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 5th day of December, 2024.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

Sonya Flint, Historic and Scenic
Preservation Commission
Secretary

EXHIBIT A
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
DEMOLITION NO. 394

1. This approval is to demolish an approximately 360 square-foot detached accessory structure over 50 years of age located at 1051 Walnut Ave (APN: 0175-053-20-0000) within the Suburban Residential (R-S) District.
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.