



**INITIAL STUDY AND
NEGATIVE DECLARATION
P22-0018**

March 2022

PROJECT NAME:	City of Vista Small Lot Residential Development Requirements in Title 18 - Zoning in the Development Code of the Chartered City of Vista, California
PROJECT LOCATIONS:	Citywide
PROJECT APPLICANT:	City of Vista 200 Civic Center Drive Vista, California 92084-6275
LEAD AGENCY	City of Vista Community Development Department Planning Division 200 Civic Center Drive Vista, California 92084-6275 Lead Agency Contact: Patsy Chow, Deputy Director/City Planner (760) 643-5390
PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD:	March 24, 2022 to April 12, 2022

This Negative Declaration and Initial Study have been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section, 15000, et seq.). It is available for a 20-day public review period as shown above.

Comments regarding this document must be made **in writing** to Ms. Patsy Chow, c/o Planning Division, 200 Civic Center Drive, Vista, California 92084-6275, and mailed to this address or sent via e-mail to pchow@cityofvista.com. All comments must be received in the Planning Division office no later than 5:00 P.M. on the last day of the public review period noted above.

This page left intentionally blank.

A. INTRODUCTION

The City of Vista (City) Planning Division has prepared this Negative Declaration/Initial Study (ND/IS) to evaluate the potential environmental consequences associated with its citywide addition of small lot residential development requirements. As part of the approval process, a project is required to undergo an environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). One of the main objectives of CEQA is to disclose to the public and decision makers the potential environmental effects of proposed activities. CEQA requires that the lead agency prepare an IS to determine whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), a Negative Declaration (ND), or a Mitigated ND is needed. The Planning Division is the lead agency for the proposed project under CEQA, and the Division has determined that a ND is the appropriate environmental document for the proposed project as shown in the IS portion of this document.

AUTHORITY

The preparation of this ND/IS is governed by two principal sets of documents: CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations Section 15000, et seq.). Specifically, the preparation of an ND/IS is guided by the State CEQA Guidelines; Section 15063 describes the requirements for initial studies, and Sections 15070 and 15071 describe the processes and requirements for the preparation of an ND. Where appropriate and supportive to an understanding of the issues, reference may be made either to the CEQA statute or State CEQA Guidelines. This ND/IS contains all of the contents required by the State CEQA Guidelines, which includes a brief project description, the location of the project (including on a map), name of the project proponent, and a proposed finding that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

B. EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

CITY OF VISTA

Vista is a largely built-out, predominantly low-density residential community located seven miles inland from the Pacific Ocean in northern San Diego County. Clusters of urbanized higher density developments are scattered throughout its central portion, generally along major transit routes or corridors. The city is located in rolling topography of the western foothills of the San Marcos Mountains, with elevations ranging from approximately 200 feet to about 750 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). Pleasant views are found from various points throughout the city with some higher elevations offering captivating vistas of the Pacific Ocean to the west. In addition to the pleasing topography of the mountains and hills, Vista is lushly vegetated from the low-level creek beds to the steep slopes of the foothills, which also contributes to the overall beauty of the community. The city also has three major creeks that flow through its boundaries, Buena Vista Creek, Agua Hedionda Creek, and Buena Creek. The surrounding land uses and setting for the proposed project are those parcels within the city that are within R-1-B and R-M (up to a density of 15 dwelling units per acre) residential zones.

C. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

BACKGROUND

The small lot development regulations as outlined by Chapter 18.33 of the Vista Development Code are being proposed in an effort to allow for individual ownership of single-family lots and detached single-family homes at comparable densities of developed condominium projects. In recent years, Vista has seen significant interest in small lot single-family residential

developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities for individuals trying to buy a home in Vista. Because the City's Development Code does not currently allow for small single-family lots (i.e., lots that are less than 6,000 square feet), most developers pursuing small lot residential projects have instead developed detached owner-occupied condominium units with common underlying ownership under a condominium map structure.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

In general, the proposed project consists of an ordinance that adds Chapter 18.33, Small Lot Residential Development Requirements, of the City's Development Code to introduce certain small lot requirements and associated standards. Specifically, the ordinance is also intended to provide code simplification and clarity for creation of owner-occupied housing opportunities and small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership. Staff's draft recommendations are summarized below:

R-1-B and R-M (up to 15 dwelling units/acre) residential zones: New small lot residential development requirements would be applicable only within the R-1-B and R-M zones (up to a density of 15 dwelling units per acre), where the small lot development pattern most closely resembles the existing zoning requirements within these zones. Staff does not recommend introducing small lot subdivisions in lower density zones and/or semi-rural and rural neighborhoods where the small lot pattern would not be consistent with surrounding large lot developments. Conversely, it is not recommended to introduce small lot developments in higher density zones (above 15 dwelling units per acre) as this could adversely impact the opportunities for higher density housing per the City's Housing Element.

Requirements for Small Lot Development: Ensure that standards, such as a minimum lot size of 3,600 square feet and a lot width of 45 feet are met. Sidewalks and landscaped parkways would be required on both sides of the street with minimum 6-foot wide landscaped parkways. On-street parking would be required on both sides of the street whether a public or private street. Common and private open space requirements would apply. Other standards would include treatment for walls and fences, landscaping requirements and storage space for each unit.

Development Standards: These include setback requirements, building height, and utility provisions. Proposed front yard setbacks are 20 feet to the face of the garage and 10 feet to the remainder of the home, 5 feet on the sides and 10 feet in the rear yard. The proposed building height is two stories or 35 feet, whichever is lowest, consistent with all other single-family zones' height requirements. In addition, all overhead utilities on the project site would be required to be placed underground.

Process: Small lot development projects would be processed and reviewed via submittal of a discretionary application for a Tentative Parcel Map or Tentative Subdivision Map along with a Site Development Plan. These applications would be reviewed by the Planning Commission and would be appealable to the City Council, consistent with all other major subdivision applications. Applicable fees would apply at the time of submittal to the City. If a zone change or General Plan amendment are requested by the applicant along with a small lot development application, the project would require final review by the City Council following a recommendation from the Planning Commission.

D. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

This ND/IS evaluates the proposed project’s effects on the following environmental topics:

- aesthetics
- agricultural resources
- air quality
- biological resources
- cultural resources
- geology and soils
- greenhouse gas emissions
- hazards and hazardous materials
- hydrology and water quality
- land use planning
- mineral resources
- noise
- population and housing
- public services
- recreation
- transportation/traffic
- utilities and service systems
- mandatory findings of significance

Based upon the evaluation presented in the following Initial Study, implementation of the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

Therefore, on the basis of this initial evaluation:

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



 Patsy Chow, Deputy Director of Community Development /
 City Planner

3/22/2022
 Date

E. INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The following checklist provides an analysis of the proposed project's potential to result in

significant adverse environmental impacts.

Section 15063(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines indicates that the purpose of an Initial Study is to:

1. Provide the Lead Agency (The City of Vista) with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an EIR or ND;
2. Enable an applicant or Lead Agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts before an EIR is prepared, thereby enabling the project to qualify for a ND;
3. Assist the preparation of an EIR, if one is required, by:
 - a) Focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant;
 - b) Identifying the effects determined not to be significant;
 - c) Explaining the reasons why potentially significant effects would not be significant; and,
 - d) Identifying whether a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process can be used for analysis of the project's environmental effects.
4. Facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a project.
5. Provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding in a ND that a project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
6. Eliminate unnecessary EIRs.
7. Determine whether a previously prepared EIR could be used with the project.

Impact Terminology

The following terminology is used to describe the level of significance of impacts:

- A finding of *no impact* is appropriate if the analysis concludes that the project would not affect the particular topic area in any way.
- An impact is considered *less than significant* if the analysis concludes that it would cause no substantial adverse change to the environment and requires no mitigation.
- An impact is considered *less than significant with mitigation incorporated* if the analysis concludes that it would cause no substantial adverse change to the environment with the inclusion of environmental commitments that have been agreed to by the applicant.
- An impact is considered *potentially significant* if the analysis concludes that it could have a substantial adverse effect on the environment.

I. Aesthetics <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a.-d. No Impact. Adoption of the proposed ordinance that would add Chapter 18.33, Small Lot Residential Requirements, is intended to provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in any substantial adverse changes to scenic vistas or resources, degrade existing visual character, or create substantial sources of light or glare. As a result, significant impacts to aesthetic resources would not occur.

II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Convert Prime Farmland as defined in the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000, or Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation, to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

DISCUSSION

a-e. No Impact. Adoption of the proposed ordinance that would add Chapter 18.33, Small Lot Residential Requirements, is intended to provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use, conflict with any existing zoning for agricultural use or forest land, or involve other changes in the existing environment that would result in the conversion of farmland or forest land to other uses. Significant impacts to any existing agricultural or forest resources would not occur.

III. Air Quality <i>Would the project.</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed qualitative thresholds for ozone precursors?)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-e. No Impact. Adoption of the proposed ordinance that would add Chapter 18.33, Small Lot Residential Requirements, is intended to provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts related to conflicts with air quality plans or standards. Similarly, impacts resulting in cumulatively considerable net increases to non-attainment criteria pollutants are not expected. The proposed revisions would also not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or create objectionable odors. As a result, significant impacts to air quality would not arise from implementation of the proposed project.

IV. Biological Resources <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	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 and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a.-f. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts to biological resources.

V. Cultural Resources <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code §21074?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries (see Public Resources Code, Ch. 1.75, § 5097.98, and Health and Safety Code § 7050.5(b))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a.-d. No Impact. Adoption of the proposed ordinance that would add Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. As a result, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to historic, archaeological or tribal cultural resources, or human remains. Therefore significant impacts to cultural resources would not occur.

VI. Geology and Soils <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. 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 known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Pub 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion, or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a.-f. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts to geology and soils.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions <i>Would the project.</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a.-b. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. The modifications to this Development Code would not contribute to the inducement of growth that would contribute to increased greenhouse gas emissions or conflict with applicable plans, policies or regulations that reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases. As such the proposed project would not have a significant impact.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 or on other state environmental databases and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a.-h. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. As a result, the additions to the Development Code would not interfere with any emergency response plans, emergency evacuation plans, and would not create any potential health hazards, or expose people or property to existing sources of significant hazards. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts.

IX. Hydrology and Water Quality <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including but not limited to increasing pollutant discharges to receiving waters?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-j. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. As a result, the additions to the Code is not anticipated to result in significant impacts to

water quality standards, existing drainage patterns or drainage systems, or expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding. Therefore significant impacts to hydrology and water quality would not occur.

X. Land Use and Planning <i>Would the project.</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 Comprehensive Plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a.-c. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not by itself result in any substantial adverse changes to land use plans, policies or regulations, would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established community, and would not be incompatible with existing land uses. Any future physical development of a site would be fully analyzed for any potential environmental effects at the time of formal submittal to the City.

XI. Mineral Resources <i>Would the project.</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local Comprehensive Plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a.-b. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be

discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. As a result, adoption of the revisions to this Development Code would not result in significant impacts to mineral resources.

XII.Noise <i>Would the project result in:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. For a project in the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-f. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. As a result, the modifications to the Development Code would not expose people to generation of noise or groundborne vibration levels in excess of any noise standards, would not produce substantial temporary or permanent increases in ambient noise levels, or subject people to noise levels from public or private airports. As such, the proposed project would not result in significant noise impacts.

XIII. Population and Housing <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through an extension of roads or other infra-structure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-c. No Impact. Adoption of the proposed Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not by itself contribute to the inducement of population growth or the displacement of any existing housing or people. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. Any future physical development of a site would be fully analyzed for any potential environmental effects at the time of formal submittal to the City.

XIV. Public Services <i>a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or 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 following public services.</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Maintenance of public facilities including roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a1 – a5. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. No additional public services are anticipated as result of the adoption of these code

revisions. Therefore, significant impacts to these services would not occur.

XV. Recreation <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a.-b. No Impact. Adoption of the proposed Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not by itself contribute to the inducement of population growth; therefore, the project would not increase the need for recreational opportunities. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, no significant impacts to recreation would occur.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads and highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-g. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not by itself result in any substantial increases in traffic, or exceed any level of service standards, or result in increased road hazards, inadequate emergency access or conflicts with alternative transportation policies. As a result, no significant transportation or traffic impacts would occur. Any future physical development of a site would be fully analyzed for any potential environmental effects at the time of formal submittal to the City.

XVII. Utilities and Service Systems <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a-g. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. No additional utilities and service systems are expected as result of the adoption of these

code revisions. Therefore, no significant impacts to these service systems would occur.

XVIII. Mandatory Finding of Significance <i>Would the project</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable (<i>"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</i>)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

DISCUSSION

a.-c. No Impact. These new requirements by themselves do not propose or authorize any development. Future applications for development under the proposed ordinance would be discretionary and would be reviewed independently for potential environmental impacts. Therefore, the addition of Chapter 18.33 of the Development Code would not result in significant impacts. The new requirements essentially provide opportunities for small lot single-family residential developments as another way to promote homeownership and owner-occupied housing opportunities in Vista. As discussed in the preceding sections, the addition of Chapter 18.33 by itself does not have the potential to significantly degrade the quality of the environment, including effects on animals or plants, or to eliminate historic or prehistoric sites. As discussed in the preceding sections, both short-term and long-term environmental effects associated with the new regulations would not result in significant impacts. Further, when impacts associated with the project are considered alone or in combination with other impacts, the project-related impacts are not significant. The above discussions do not identify any substantial adverse impacts to people as a result of the project.

E. REFERENCES AND LIST OF PREPARERS

DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

Section 15150 of the State CEQA Guidelines permits an environmental document to incorporate by reference other documents that provide relevant data. The documents listed below are hereby incorporated by reference. The pertinent material is summarized throughout this Initial Study where that information is relevant to the analysis of impacts of the proposed project. All referenced documents that are starred * are on file and available for review at the City of Vista Planning Division office located at 200 Civic Center Drive Vista, California 92084-6275.

California Department of Conservation. 2012. *San Diego County Important Farmland Map*.

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. 1993. *Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region*. Special Report 153.

City of Vista and Buena Sanitation District. 2017. *Sewer Master Plan Update*. January. Available on-line - <http://www.cityofvista.com/city-services/city-departments/engineering/water-utilities>

City of Vista and Buena Sanitation District. 2014. *Sewer System Management Plan*. March.

City of Vista. 2015, Appendix G revised 2015. *Stormwater Standards Manual*. Available on-line, <http://www.cityofvista.com/city-services/city-departments/engineering>

City of Vista. 2011. *Vista General Plan 2030 Update and Program EIR*. Available on-line, <http://www.cityofvista.com/city-services/city-departments/community-development/common-questions/vista-general-plan-2030> *

City of Vista. Various. *Municipal Code and Development Code*. Available on-line, <http://www.cityofvista.com/city-services/city-departments/community-development/common-questions/municipal-development-codes>.

Vista Irrigation District. 2017. *Potable Water Master Plan*.

Vista Irrigation District. 2020. *2020 Urban Water Management Plan*.

INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS CONSULTED

John Conley, Director - Community Development Dept. & Engineering Dept., City of Vista

PREPARER

Patsy Chow, Deputy Director/City Planner, City of Vista