

**CITY OF LOMPOC
PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**



MEETING DATE: SEPTEMBER 13, 2004
TO: MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: LUCILLE T. BREESE, AICP
CITY PLANNER
RE: DR 04-20 DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

AGENDA ITEM NO. 8

A request by Vince Elizondo, Director of the Parts and Recreation Department, for Planning Commission consideration of a proposal to install eight (8) seventy-foot (70') poles with 1500-watt metal halide lamps for athletic lighting purposes. The property is located in an Open Space (OS) Zoning District at 601 and 701 East Chestnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number 85-040-05 and 85-040-06). A Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

AUTHORITY:

The Planning Commission has the authority to approve, conditionally approve, modify, or deny a request for a Development Plan required prior to issuance of a building permit (LCC Section 8502).

SITE DATA:

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------|---|
| 1. | Property Owner | City of Lompoc |
| 2. | Site Location | 601 and 701 East Chestnut Avenue |
| 3. | Assessor Parcel Number | 85-040-05 and -06 |
| 4. | Site Zoning | Open Space (OS) |
| 5. | General Plan Designation | Community Facility |
| 6. | Current Site Use | Johns Manville Park |
| 7. | Surrounding Uses/Zoning | North -- Commercial Industrial / CM
South -- Residential / R-2
East -- Commercial Industrial / CM
West -- Commercial Industrial / CM |
| 8. | Site Area | 6.5 acres |

CONFORMANCE WITH ADOPTED CITY POLICIES:

GENERAL PLAN:

The General Plan Land Use Designation for the project site is *Community Facility*. The purpose of this Designation is:

To provide areas to meet the public service, educational, recreational, social, and cultural needs of Valley residents.

The park use is consistent with the stated purpose.

ZONING ORDINANCE:

The site is currently zoned *Open Space (O-S)*. When the Council adopted the General Plan in 1997, Resolution No. 4641 (97) stated that when an inconsistency exists between the General Plan Land Use Designation and the Zoning Designation, the property in question is to be developed in conformance with the General Plan Land Use Designation. In the case of this property that would mean that the requirements of the *Public Facilities (P-F)* zoning district must be met. The stated purpose of the *P-F* District is:

To provide for those uses and activities which serve the public and are generally conducted by government agencies or eleemosynary and philanthropic non-profit organizations.

The site is zoned *Open Space (OS)* and the existing park is a permitted use in both the *O-S* and *P-F* zones. The facility contains two backstops, parking spaces public restrooms, playground equipment, picnic tables and benches, a concession stand, and playing fields. There is currently lighting on the west field which was installed in the 1970s and is considered to be obsolete under current standards. Photos of the existing lighting, which is installed on old telephone poles, will be available at the meeting for review. There was lighting on the east field at one time but that was removed a number of years ago, according to City staff. The park is currently utilized by a variety of organized youth sport teams for practice fields (soccer, baseball, football, etc.). The City is proposing improvements to modernize the existing lights which have been in place for many years. The fields are used for practice from 5 p.m. or dusk to 10 p.m., no change is proposed in the hours that the park will be in use.

The lights are proposed on 70' poles and each field will have four (4) poles as shown on the attached site plan. This is intended to provide adequate lighting and reduce glare and spillage of light off the project site. The fixtures will be shielded and directed downward and onto the playing field. The specifications provided by the manufacturer indicate that reducing the height of the pole increases the possibility of glare impact and off-site spill from the lights.

There is a public address system that is currently utilized for games but not practices. Both fields have electronic scoreboards. There are no change proposed in the park activities beyond the installation of the lights.

The PF District has a building height limitation of thirty-five (35) feet as measured from the finished grade to the top of any structure. The light fixtures are proposed to be seventy (70) feet in height. The Commission may make the finding that the proposed light fixtures meet the Exception allowed by the Zoning Ordinance Section 7013 for structures such as elevator shafts, spires, flagpoles, and other portions of buildings that would extend beyond the traditional roofline as long as they are installed in a safe manner. Generally, light poles extend beyond the height of buildings that they serve and in the event of park lighting, they stand alone to light the athletic fields.

A Building Permit will be required to assure that the poles are installed in a safe manner. The Engineering Division will prepare the plans and work with the electrical contractor to assure that the proposed lights meet the requirements imposed by the Commission.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

An Initial Environmental Study has been prepared for this project in accordance with the City of Lompoc Environmental Guidelines and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). No significant impacts were identified and a Negative Declaration has been prepared for Commission review and certification. A Notice of Determination will be filed following the Commission action as required by CEQA.

STAFF REVIEW:

A Development Review Board (DRB) meeting was held for this project on August 16, 2004. The applicant representative met with staff to discuss the proposal and draft Conditions of Approval were formulated. The following comments were received:

Building Division: A building permit shall be required to comply with all State and local codes.

The Development Review Board (DRB) has developed a series of standard conditions of approval (COA) to advise applicants of possible requirements during the development review process. Project specific conditions are included when staff can determine what they should be from the conceptual plans provided for Commission review. A complete plan check occurs after construction plans have been submitted to the Building Division for building permits. Please note that not all COA included with the Planning Commission Resolution for the project may be applicable. If the applicant has questions and/or concerns regarding specific conditions, he/she should contact the department/division that is recommending the COA. DRB members to not attend the Commission meeting and Planning staff cannot answer specific questions regarding conditions recommended by other departments/divisions.

NOTICING:

Notice of the Public Hearing was published in the Lompoc Record on August 2004. All property owners of record, within 300 feet of the subject property, were notified of the public hearing by U.S. Mail on September 3, 2004.

APPEAL RIGHTS:

Any person has the right to appeal the Planning Commission action to the City Council within ten days of the action. Contact a Planning Division staff member for the required appeal form, the fee is \$34.30.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Planning Commission

- 1. Certify the Mitigated Negative Declaration;**
- 2. Adopt Resolution No. 381 (04) approving the proposed lighting fixtures, based upon the findings of fact in the resolution and including the attached draft Conditions of Approval.**

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Draft PC Resolution No. 381 (04)
2. Draft Negative Declaration and Initial Environmental Study
3. Site Plan and Lighting Exhibit
(Planning Commission only, available in Planning Division for review)

RESOLUTION NO. 381 (04)

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOMPOC APPROVING A DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR INSTALLATION OF IMPROVEMENTS AT JM PARK LOCATED AT 601 AND 701 EAST CHESTNUT AVENUE (DR 04-20)

WHEREAS, a request was received from Vince Elizondo, Director of the Parks and Recreation Department for the City of Lompoc, for Planning Commission consideration of a proposal to install eight (8) seventy-foot (70') poles with 1500-watt metal halide lamps for athletic lighting purposes. The project is located at John Manville (JM) Park at 601 and 701 East Chestnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel Numbers: 85-040-05 and -06) and is zoned Open Space (O-S); and

WHEREAS, the request was considered by the Planning Commission at a duly-noticed public meeting on September 13, 2004; and

WHEREAS, at the meeting of September 13, 2004, _____, was present and answered Planning Commissioners' questions and addressed their concerns; and

WHEREAS, at the meeting of September 13, 2004, _____ spoke in favor of, and _____ spoke in opposition to, the project.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LOMPOC RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1: After hearing testimony, considering the evidence presented, and due deliberation of the matters presented, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed park improvements, as conditioned, meet the requirements of the Lompoc City Code and are consistent with the applicable policies and development standards, therefore it can be found that:

- A. The site for the proposed use is adequate in size and topography to accommodate said use, and all yards, spaces, walls and fences, loading, and landscaping are adequate to properly adjust such use with the land and uses in the vicinity.
- B. The conditions stated in the decision are deemed necessary to protect the public health, safety, and welfare.
- C. The site of the proposed use relates to streets and highways adequate in width and pavement to carry the quantity and kind of traffic generated by the proposed use.

- D. The exception to the height of the light poles is allowed to provide safe and adequate lighting that reduces the glare and directs the light onto the practice field, thereby reducing any negative impacts to the residential use on the southern boundary of the park.
- E. The use will have no adverse effect upon the abutting and surrounding property from the permitted use thereof.

SECTION 2. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21089 and Section 15074 of the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, the Initial Environmental Study and Negative Declaration which have been prepared for the proposal show no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, and therefore it can be found that:

- F. The proposed project, as conditioned, does not have a significant effect on the environment; and
- G. Any effect of the proposed use upon fish and wildlife is de minimis and therefore no filing fee is required pursuant to the Fish and Game Code Section 711.4.

SECTION 3: Based upon the foregoing DR 04-13 is approved as proposed on September 13, 2004, subject to the conditions attached as Exhibit A which are incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein.

The foregoing resolution, on motion by Commissioner _____, seconded by Commissioner _____, was adopted at the regular Planning Commission meeting of September 13, 2004, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

Arleen T. Pelster, AICP, Secretary

Jack Rodenhi, Chair

Attachment: Exhibit A - Conditions of Approval

**DRAFT - CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
DR 04-20 – Johns Manville Park -- 601 East Chestnut Avenue
(Assessor Parcel Numbers: 85-040-05 and -06)**

The following Conditions of Approval are approved by the Planning Commission based upon the Electrical Site Plan prepared by Thoma Engineering and received by the City on July 30, 2004.

I. PLANNING

Planning - General Conditions

- P1. All applicable provisions of the Lompoc City Code are made a part of these conditions of approval in their entirety, as if fully contained herein.
- P6. Minor changes to the site plan, architectural elevations, or landscape plans shall be reviewed by the City Planner and approved if acceptable. Major changes to the site plan, architectural elevations, or landscape plans shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved if acceptable.
- P7. Prior to the installation of any signage or sign related construction the applicant shall obtain all appropriate permits.

Planning - Site Plan Conditions

- P8. The applicant shall submit a lighting plan which incorporates the following:
 - a. Within one hour after each major tenant's closing, lighting in the parking areas adjacent to each tenant shall be reduced to a minimal level of lighting necessary for safety and security; and the illumination of signs and landscaping adjacent to each tenant shall be curtailed.
 - b. All lighting shall be shielded to prevent glare and minimize light intrusion to adjacent properties. The adequacy and design of the on-site lighting and shielding shall be reviewed by staff at plan check.
- P9. Lighting standards shall not exceed 70 feet in height.
- P10. Hours of operation for the lights shall be from dusk to 10 p.m.
- P11. Hours of construction shall be limited to:
 - Monday through Friday - between the hours of 7 a.m. and 5 p.m.
 - Saturday - between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m.
 - Sunday - NoneMinor modifications to the hours of construction may be granted by the City Planner.

II. BUILDING

BUILDING AND FIRE SAFETY

Building - General Conditions

- B1. Project shall comply with the most recent adopted City and State building codes.
- B2. Plans shall be submitted by a California licensed architect and/or engineer. Structural calculations showing compliance with the California Building Code shall accompany all plans.
- B4. Dimensioned building setbacks and property lines, street centerlines, and between buildings or other structures shall be designated on plot plans.

III. AVIATION/TRANSPORTATION – no project specific conditions

IV. ENGINEERING -- No General or Project Specific Conditions

V. SOLID WASTE -- No General or Project Specific Conditions

VI. ELECTRIC

Electric – General Conditions

- EL1. The Developer shall sign a line extension agreement and pay all costs for the City to furnish and install electric power lines to and within the proposed development. These costs shall include all labor, labor overhead, material, material handling charge and equipment/vehicle rental necessary for the City to extend the City's electric distribution system to serve the project. The total estimated cost, as mentioned in the Line Extension Agreement, must be paid prior to the City issuance of building permits.
- EL2. The Developer shall provide a single line diagram showing voltage, phase, load requirements and size of planned switchboard.

Three-phase electric services up to 200 Amps shall have 7-jaw meter sockets. Three-phase electric services above 200 Amps shall have 13-jaw meter sockets and provisions for a test switch and for current transformers. The main switchboard shall conform to Electric Utility Service Equipment Requirements approved by the City of Lompoc. The developer shall pay the Meter Installation Fee prior to the issuance of the building permit.

- EL3. Electric meters and main disconnect switches shall be located on the exterior of the building, or in an enclosure opening only to the exterior of the building. Meter enclosures shall be accessible at all times to Electric Division personnel. If the enclosure is to be locked, the lock shall be keyed to Schlage Lock No. C38587.
- EL4. The Developer shall provide all necessary trenching and backfilling to Electric specifications. This shall include trenching for primary cable, secondary cable, street light wiring and associated vaults and boxes. The developer shall provide transformer pads as required. The project shall be at final grade prior to trenching for installation of underground electric facilities.
- EL5. The Developer shall furnish and install the service wire and conduit from the service panel to the transformer or secondary box. Upon approval of the building inspector, the City shall make the final connections to the transformer and energize the transformer.
- EL6. For three-phase electrical service over 200 Amps, the Developer shall run a telephone service wire to the meter location for remote meter readings.

IX. WATER -- No General or Project Specific Conditions

X. WASTEWATER -- No General or Project Specific Conditions

CITY OF LOMPOC NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code and the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended to date, a Negative Declaration is hereby made on the following project:

Title: Development Plan DR 04-20

Location: 601 and 701 East Chestnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel No: 85-040-05, 06)

Description: A request by Vince Elizondo, City of Lompoc Parks and Recreation Department Director, for Planning Commission consideration of a proposal to install eight (8) seventy-foot (70') poles with 1500-watt metal halide lamps for athletic lighting purposes. The property is located in an *Open Space (OS)* Zoning District at 601 and 701 East Chestnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number 85-040-05 and 85-040-06).

The Planning Division of the City of Lompoc has determined that:

- There are no significant adverse environmental impacts created by this project.
- There are no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with this project if the following conditions/mitigation measures are met.

August 15, 2004
Date

Lucille T. Breese, AICP, City Planner
for Planning Division

**CITY OF LOMPOC
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

A. PROJECT INFORMATION:

Project Title: Development Plan – Johns Manville Park	Project No: DR 04-20																		
Lead Agency Name and Address: City of Lompoc 100 Civic Center Plaza, Lompoc, CA 93436 P.O. Box 8001, Lompoc, CA 93438-8001	Contact Person and Phone Number: Lucille T. Breese, AICP City Planner (805) 875-8273																		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION / LOCATION: A request by Vince Elizondo, Director of the Parks and Recreation Department, for Planning Commission consideration of a proposal to install eight (8) seventy-foot (70') poles with 1500-watt metal halide lamps for athletic lighting purposes. The property is located in an <i>Open Space (OS)</i> Zoning District at 601 and 701 East Chestnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number 85-040-05 and 85-040-06). A Negative Declaration has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).																			
Public Agencies with Approval Authority (Including permits, funding, or participation agreements): City of Lompoc																			
Project Applicant, Name and Address: Vince Elizondo, Director City of Lompoc Parks and Recreation Department 125 West Walnut Avenue Lompoc, CA 93436 (805) 875-8100	Project Consultant: Thoma Engineering 3562 Empleo Street, Suite C PO Box 1167 San Luis Obispo, CA 93406 (805) 543-3850																		
General Plan Designation: Community Facilities (CF)	City Zoning Designation: Open Space (OS)																		
Surrounding Land Use Designation: North - Light Industrial South - Medium Density Residential East - General Industrial West - Light Industrial	Surrounding Land Uses: North - Rail Yard South - Single and Multi-Family Residential East - Auto Repair and Servicing West - Lumber Yard																		
Environmental Setting: Existing urbanized area.																			
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.																			
<table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 33%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics</td> <td style="width: 33%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources</td> <td style="width: 33%;"><input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Noise</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Public Services</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Recreation</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	
<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality																	
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils																	
<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning																	
<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing																	
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic																	
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance																		

B. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

Identify the potential for significant adverse impacts below. Note mitigation measures, if available, for significant adverse impacts.

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

Comments:

- a) The proposed athletic lighting will not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista as there is no scenic vista in the immediate area identified on the City of Lompoc Urban Design Features Map in the Urban Design Element of the City's General Plan, adopted in October of 1997.
- b) The proposed athletic lighting will not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway, as it is not located adjacent to a state scenic highway.
- c) The proposed athletic lighting will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, the area is currently developed as a park and the fields are currently utilized for practice by youth sports organizations.
- d) The proposed athletic lighting replace existing lighting with more efficient fixtures that will be shielded and directed on the playing fields.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?				X

Comments:

- a-c) The proposed athletic lighting will not 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. The site is within the existing City limits, has not recently been utilized for farming or any other agricultural use or Williamson Act contract, and is surrounded by existing development.

III AIR QUALITY	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				X
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				X
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				X

Comments:

- a-d) The proposed project will not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the applicable air quality plan, or violate any air quality standards, or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, because the proposed athletic lighting will not result in a substantial increase in new air emissions since the existing use will continue.
- e) The proposed project will not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, as lighting is not a significant source of odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
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?				X
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?				X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
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?				X

Comments:

- a-d) The proposed athletic lighting will not have a substantial adverse effect on any species identified as a sensitive species in local or regional plans or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, nor will the project affect federally protected wetlands, nor will the project affect migratory wildlife corridors, nor will the project affect biological resources, because the project is proposed on a site in an urbanized area, which is not identified in the Lompoc General Plan as being in an area of biological significance.
- e-f) The site is not identified on the "Biologically Significant Areas" Map located in the City of Lompoc General Plan adopted October 1997.

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

outside of formal cemeteries?				
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Comments:

- a-b) The proposed athletic lighting will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical or archaeological resource, as identified in Section 15064.5, because the subject site is not identified in the City of Lompoc Cultural Resource Study as having an historical or archaeological resource on the site.
- c-d) The proposed athletic lighting will not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature. The site is not identified on the "Archeological Sensitivity Zones" Map located in the City of Lompoc General Plan adopted October 1997.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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.				X
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				X
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
iv) Landslides?				X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				X
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 reading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
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?				X
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?				X

Comments:

- a) The site is not identified on the City of Lompoc General Plan "Geologic and Soils Hazards" Map as being located in an area subject to liquefaction, landslides, or seismic activity, therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death.

b-e) Based upon the 1987 study by the Morro Group, "City of Lompoc Seismic and Geologic Conditions Study", the area is not subject to unusual geologic activity nor does it have unique features.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				X
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?				X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
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?				X
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?				X
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?				X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
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?				X

Comments:

- a-c) The proposed athletic lighting will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as hazardous materials will not be used, transported, stored, or disposed of on the site.
- d) The proposed athletic lighting will not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, based on a check of the lists prepared by the Certified Unified Program Agency of unauthorized releases and fuel tank locations.
- e-f) The proposed athletic lighting is not located within the Lompoc Municipal Airport land use plan. The proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip, based on review of the Lompoc Municipal Airport land use plan and the Lompoc General Plan.
- g) The proposed athletic lighting will not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan because the project will not involve the installation of permanent barriers to travel.

- h) The proposed athletic lighting 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, because the project site is located in the urbanized area of the City of Lompoc.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
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)?				X
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?				X
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.				X
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
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?				X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
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?				X
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

Comments:

- a-e) The athletic lighting will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; the project will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge; the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area; the project will not create or contribute run-off water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted run-off. The site is currently developed as a park.

- f) The proposed athletic lighting, will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality. There are no rivers or creeks within the project area.
- g) The proposed athletic lighting, is located in Zone X of Community Panel No. 060334-0003D, revised 05 June 97 outside the 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Flood Insurance Rate Map. The "Flood Hazard Areas" map in the Lompoc General Plan, adopted October 1997, does not identify the project area as being within a flood hazard area.
- h) The proposed athletic lighting 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.
- i-j) The proposed athletic lighting will not create a threat of inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The subject site is located approximately 8 miles from the ocean, so tsunamis are unlikely. The site is also not located near a water body or a significant slope or volcano, so mudflows and seiches are unlikely.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
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?				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Comments:

- a) The proposed athletic lighting will not physically divide an established community, as it is located within the existing City limits in an established area.
- b) The proposed athletic lighting will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental affect, as the proposed project is consistent with the City General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.
- c) There is not a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, which applies to the site, therefore, there will be no conflict with such a plan.

X MINERAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
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?				X

Comments:

- a-b) The proposed athletic lighting will not result in a loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state as the "Mineral Resources" Map in the Lompoc General Plan, adopted October 1997, does not identify the project area as being a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

XI. NOISE Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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?				X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?				X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X
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?				X
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?				X

Comments:

- a-b) The proposed athletic lighting will not expose persons to, or generate, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, nor will it expose persons to excessive groundborne noise levels. Athletic lighting is not considered a substantial source of noise. Existing conditions at the part will remain unchanged regarding the hours of operation of the fields.
- c) The proposed athletic lighting will not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. There is currently a public address system installed at this location which is utilized on a limited basis during games, it is not utilized for practices.
- d) Short-term noise impacts for the construction of the athletic lighting system will be minimal.
- e-f) The proposed athletic lighting is not located within an airport land use plan, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 roads and other infrastructure)?				X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Comments:

- a) The proposed athletic lighting will not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly or indirectly, as the project consists of improvements to park infrastructure.
- b-c) The site of the proposed athletic lighting will not displace any people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, as the project is located at an existing park site.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a) Substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				X
b) Fire Protection?				X
c) Police protection?				X
d) Schools?				X
e) Parks?				X
f) Other public facilities?				X

Comments:

- a-f) The proposed athletic lighting will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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 Fire, Police, Schools, Parks, or other public services, because the site is currently within an urbanized area which is already adequately served by City services. The city has sufficient resources to provide required services.

XIV. RECREATION Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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?			X	
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?				X

Comments:

- a) The proposed construction of an athletic lighting system will not substantially increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreation facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated. The park use will remain unchanged, the intent of the improvement is to modernize the existing lights and to make the system more efficient for the use by youth sports for practice fields
- b) Because this project involves an upgrade to an existing park facility, no construction or expansion of recreational facilities is required, and therefore no impact will result.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	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)?				X
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				X
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?				X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				X
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				X

Comments:

- a) The proposed athletic lighting will not cause an increase in traffic which is substantial, in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system, because the construction of an athletic lighting system will not induce a substantial increase in vehicle trips in such a manner that would impact road capacity or intersection congestion.
- b) The proposed athletic lighting will not exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways, because the athletic lighting will not substantially increase the amount of traffic in the area.
- c) The proposed athletic lighting will not 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 because the proposed project is located a substantial distance from the Lompoc Airport and Vandenberg Air Force Base.
- d) The proposed athletic lighting will not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses as the project is located in an established park, and is served by an existing paved roadway.
- e-f) The proposed athletic lighting will not result in inadequate emergency access or parking capacity, as the project will not result in blocked roadways and on site parking is provided.
- g) The proposed athletic lighting will not conflict with policies, plans or programs which support alternative transportation, including buses and bicycles, as the project will not result in blocked roadways, bikeways or reduced parking.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Coast Region of the Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
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?				X
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?				X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?				X
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?				X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?				X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X

Comments:

- a) The proposed athletic lighting will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, as the site is serviced by a sewer line and wastewater treatment facility that meets the standards set by the regional water quality control board.
- b-c) The proposed athletic lighting will not require the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities, or expansion of existing facilities, as the project does not propose any facilities that would increase water usage or wastewater emission in such a manner that would require additional water or wastewater system capacity.
- d-e) The project site is located within the City of Lompoc city limits. The project was studied as part of the General Plan EIR update in October 1997. The City has sufficient resources to service the site with water and wastewater facilities.
- f-g) The City of Lompoc landfill has sufficient capacity to service the project. The project will conform to regulations regarding solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE Does the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) 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?				X
b) 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)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:	
X	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Lucille T. Breese, AICP
City Planner

Date

CITY OF LOMPOC NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Pursuant to the State of California Public Resources Code and the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended to date, a Negative Declaration is hereby made on the following project:

Title: Development Plan DR 04-20

Location: 601 and 701 East Chestnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel No: 85-040-05, 06)

Description: A request by Vince Elizondo, City of Lompoc Parks and Recreation Department Director, for Planning Commission consideration of a proposal to install eight (8) seventy-foot (70') poles with 1500-watt metal halide lamps for athletic lighting purposes. The property is located in an *Open Space (OS)* Zoning District at 601 and 701 East Chestnut Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number 85-040-05 and 85-040-06).

The Planning Division of the City of Lompoc has determined that:

There are no significant adverse environmental impacts created by this project.

There are no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with this project if the following conditions/mitigation measures are met.

August 15, 2004

Date

Lucille T. Breese, AICP, City Planner
for Planning Division