

REQUEST FOR HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ACTION

V.A. **ROBERT LEE, APPLICANT** (PROJECT PLANNER: ROSEMARY MONTOYA)

1. **PUBLIC HEARING** to consider **Demolition No. 396** – A request to demolish an approximately 288 square foot accessory structure over 50 years of age located at 425 Cajon St (APN: 0173-051-07-0000) within the Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District. This proposal may qualify for exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301(l)(4) (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines.

HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION MEETING: JUNE 5, 2025

Planner: Rosemary Montoya, Assistant Planner

Reviewed by: Brian Foote, City Planner

PROCEDURE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

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

SYNOPSIS

1. Historic Designation: The subject property is located within the Early Redlands Historic District (Historic District No. 3). The subject property is not individually designated.
2. Existing Land Use: Zoning: Administrative Professional (A-P)
General Plan: Office
3. Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission submittal dates:
 - A. Submittal Dates: April 3, 2025
 - B. Date Deemed Complete: April 17, 2025
 - C. Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission Meeting: June 5, 2025
4. Attachments:
 - A. Location Map & Aerial Photograph
 - B. Site Photographs

- C. Preliminary Environmental Checklist
- D. Resolution No. 2025-02

PROPOSAL

The applicant, Robert Lee, is proposing to demolish an approximately 288 square foot detached garage over 50 years of age located at 425 Cajon Street (APN: 0173-051-07-0000). The subject property is located within the Early Redlands Historic District (Historic District No. 3) and is not individually designated. The applicant proposes to demolish the structure to construct a new detached accessory dwelling unit.

BACKGROUND

Photographs provided by the applicant show that the detached accessory structure is approximately 288 square feet in size and serves as a garage. San Bernardino County Assessor's Office records indicate that the main residence on the property was constructed in 1897. The 1908 Sanborn map shows a detached accessory structure with the same building footprint and the structure is then labeled "auto" in the 1915 Sanborn map. However, the 1976 Historic Resources Inventory sheet indicates that this property does not have any related features, such as a barn, carriage house or shed. The City's Directories begin to list the individuals that were associated with the subject property in 1910. Based on the maps, historic aerial images, and the City's Directories associated with the subject property, the structure is at least 50 years of age.

SUMMARY

The 1908 Sanborn map shows the presence of a structure with the same building footprint. Staff is unable to locate the original building permits, but based on historical aerial images and Sanborn maps, the structure is over 50 years of age.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

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

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

- It is associated with events which have made a significant contribution to California's

history and cultural heritage.

- It is associated with the lives of persons important to our past.
- The architecture embodies distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or possesses high artistic values.
- The potential to yield any information important to history or pre-history.

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

ANALYSIS

The subject property is located within the registered Early Redlands Historic and Scenic District (Historic District No. 3) and is subject to the procedures in Section 2.24 of the Redlands Municipal Code. Section 15.44.070 requires the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission to determine the historical significance of any structure over 50 years of age prior to its demolition.

Section 2.62.170 establishes the City's criteria for historic significance. Below, each City criteria is listed with justification as to why this structure is not historically significant.

A) Local Criteria for Significance

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

According to the San Bernardino County Assessor's Office, the main residence was constructed in 1897 and Sanborn maps from 1908 show the footprint of the detached accessory structure. The original building permits for the structure's construction were not found in the city's building permit history. However, the building permits on file for the property include the following:

PERMIT TYPE	YEAR ISSUED	WORK PROPOSED
Building Permit	1944	Plumbing
Building Permit	1949	Reroof
Building Permit	2013	Reroof
Building Permit	2013	Roof-mounted Solar
Building Permit	2014	Electrical
Building Permit	2015	Roof-mounted Solar

Building Permit	2017	Foundation Rehab
-----------------	------	------------------

Staff conducted additional research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through Newspapers.com to gather information on the individuals who have resided at 425 Cajon Street. Information on these individuals is provided under Section 2.62.170(C) below. However, there is no substantial evidence that this structure makes a significant contribution to the development, heritage, or cultural characteristics of the city, state, or county.

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

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

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

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

DIRECTORY YEAR	NAME(S)	OCCUPATION
1910	Alva B. Cowgill	Secretary at Redlands Mutual Orange Distributors Company
	Chester B. Cowgill	Student
	Miss Claire Cowgill	Teacher
	Mrs. Ethel M. Cowgill	Occupation not listed
	Mrs. Nellie D. Cowgill	Occupation not listed
1911	Alva B. Cowgill	Secretary and Manager at Redlands Mutual Orange Company
	Chester B. Cowgill	Student
	Miss Claire Cowgill	Teacher
	Mrs. Ethel M. Cowgill	Occupation not listed
	Ralph Cowgill	Student
1912	Alva B. Cowgill	Secretary and Manager at Redlands Mutual Orange Company
	Chester B. Cowgill	Student
	Miss Claire Cowgill	Teacher
	Ralph Cowgill	Student
1919	Chas S. Miller	Manager at Citrus Growers Cash Association

HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
DEMOLITION NO. 395
March 6, 2025

	Emma Miller	Occupation not listed
1921	Harmon Weaver	Occupation not listed
	Luella K. Weaver	Occupation not listed
1923	Harmon Weaver	Occupation not listed
	Luella K. Weaver	Occupation not listed
1925	Harmon Weaver	Occupation not listed
	Luella K. Weaver	Occupation not listed
1927	Harmon Weaver	Occupation not listed
	Luella K. Weaver	Occupation not listed
1929	Herman Ross	Occupation not listed
	Florence N. Ross	Occupation not listed
1931	Herman Ross	Occupation not listed
	Florence N. Ross	Occupation not listed
1933	Henry T. Simpson	Carpenter
	Nora C. Simpson	Occupation not listed
1936	Laura B. Haydon	Retired
1939	Laura B. Haydon	Retired
	Maurice Leon	Tailor at Fred C. Fowler
1941	Laura B. Haydon	Retired
	Maurice Leon	Salesman at Fred C. Fowler
	Roy L. Guin	Salesman at Gair's
	Milton Smith	Bookkeeper at Mitten's Display Letters
	Vester Wyatt	Public School Teacher
1947	Mrs. Etta M. Pollard	Homemaker
	Roy M. Powell	Painter at Woessner
1950	Herbert Wheeler	Retired
	Ellen Wheeler	Occupation not listed
	Mrs. Florence O'Neill	Dialogue Coach
	Mrs. Betty Russell	Secretary
1952	Herbert Wheeler	Retired
	Ellen Wheeler	Occupation not listed
	Mrs. Florence O'Neill	Beautician
	Betty Russell	Receptionist

1954	Herbert Wheeler	Retired
	Ellen Wheeler	Occupation not listed
1958	Herbert Wheeler	Retired
	Ellen Wheeler	Occupation not listed
1961	Philip J. Henry	Public School Teacher
	Mrs. Doris Henry	Bar Manager at Van De Kamp
1965	Philip J. Henry	Counselor at Fontana School District
	Mrs. Doris Henry	Demonstrator at Van De Kamp
Beginning of San Bernardino County Assessor's Record		
2001	Doris L Henry	Occupation details not available
2007	Doris L. Henry	Occupation details not available
2013	Estate of Doris L. Henry	Occupation details not available
2013	AEI Investments LLC	Occupation details not available
2014	Sarah Hudson	Occupation details not available
	Joe Hudson	Occupation details not available
2016	Hudson Family Revocable Trust	Occupation details not available
2020	Hudson Family Revocable Trust	Occupation details not available

The first recorded owners of the property, according to the A.K. Smiley Library Directories, are the Cowgill family, listed in the 1910, 1911 and 1912 issues. Most notably, Mr. Alva B. Cowgill served as the secretary and manager of the Redlands Mutual Orange Company for 19 years and later as its president for four years. At the time of his death in 1943, he was still active as the secretary and a director of the Mutual Orange Distributors, a position he had held since the company was founded in 1906. Beyond his professional endeavors, Cowgill was a charter member of the Redlands Kiwanis Club and a dedicated member of Trinity Episcopal Church for 15 years. No additional biographical or historical information about other members of the Cowgill family was found in local newspapers or city records.

Subsequent residents of the property were primarily employed in local businesses and office jobs including as teachers, salesmen, tailors, and bookkeepers. While these individuals contributed to the local economy, there is no evidence to suggest they played a significant role in shaping the social or cultural development of Redlands.

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

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

The property is located easterly of Cajon Street, northerly of East Home Place, westerly of La Verne Street, southerly of East Fern Avenue. The structure has Bungalow style architecture and has a simplistic design consisting of an open gable roof with mounted solar panels and composite shingle roofing. The exterior is wood siding with vertical accent panels along the front elevation above the white sectional garage door. The structure is covered by overgrown vines further detracting from any possible stylistic elements. Overall, this structure does not stand out as one of the few remaining examples in the city with distinctive architectural characteristics of a specific type.

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

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

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

As discussed in Section 2.62.170(D), the garage does not embody design, details, materials, or craftsmanship that represent a significant architectural innovation. The primary dwelling has Craftsman style architecture. The garage is much simpler in design and has only been used for vehicular and general storage purposes. The structure is Bungalow style and consist of an open gable roof with mounted solar panels and composite shingle roofing. The exterior is wood siding with vertical accent panels along the front elevation above a white sectional garage door. These architectural features do not exhibit any notable design elements or distinctive craftsmanship that would set this structure apart from other properties within the city.

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

The subject structure is located in the rear yard, on the northeast corner of the property and is partially visible from the right-of-way. The 1908 Sanborn maps show that the property was originally surrounded by residences, and since then, the remaining vacant lots nearby have also been developed with residential dwellings. The site is located within the registered Early Redlands Historic and Scenic District (Historic District No. 3). The subject property is not individually listed as a designated historic resource or landmark. The main house is the most significant contributing element on the subject property (per the inventory sheet), and the garage itself does not appear to be a contributing element to the historic district.

The surrounding properties are as follows:

GENERAL PLAN	ZONING	LAND USE
--------------	--------	----------

NORTH	Office	Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District	Multi-family Residential
SOUTH	Office	Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District	Single-family Residential
WEST	Office	Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District	Single-family Residential
EAST	Office	Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District	Single-family Residential

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

The accessory structure has an unadorned design and is approximately 288 square feet in size. The exterior consists of an open gable roof with composite shingle roofing and wood siding. One permit record from 2015 was found for installation of roof-mounted solar panels to the structure. Its features are modest and do not represent unique design or detailing specific to the main residence. Its architectural elements are common and not distinctive to the overall design of the subject property.

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

The garage does not exhibit distinctive features that make it a particularly good example of a period or style. Its simple features, such as the open gable roof and wood siding, are common. The city has a wide variety of structures that illustrate better examples of the period or style. The City's Historic Context Statement indicates that the bar of significance would be significantly higher for styles that are more common throughout the City; therefore, the garage which has no significant unique architectural features would not be considered a particularly good example or one of the best examples of this style within Redlands.

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

The site is located within the registered Early Redlands Historic and Scenic District (Historic District No. 3). The subject property is not individually listed as a designated historic resource or landmark. Proposed demolition will not affect the existing main dwelling which contributes to the historic district. The garage is a minor accessory structure located at the rear of the lot. The main house is the most significant contributing element on the subject property (per the inventory sheet), and the garage itself does not appear to be a contributing element to the historic district. The driveway and curbs will also remain and there are no light standards, or signs on site that could be considered historically significant.

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

Refer to the response under 2.62.170(J) above. The demolition of the garage will not impact the visual character of the property. It will be replaced by a new accessory dwelling unit. The main house is the most significant contributing element on the subject property (per the inventory sheet), and the garage is not a contributing element to the historic district.

B) CEQA Criteria for Significance

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

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

A thorough review of local newspapers, historical records, and City directories found no evidence linking this property to any events that have made a significant contribution to California's history or cultural heritage. There is no indication that the property played a role in any major historical events or movements that would establish its importance in the broader context of the state's history.

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

As noted in the response under Section 2.62.170(C), the structure is not associated with the lives of historically significant individuals. There is no evidence in historical records or documentation to suggest that the property was linked to persons of notable historical or cultural importance. Therefore, the garage does not meet the criteria for association with individuals who have had a lasting impact on the city's history.

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

As referenced in the response under Section 2.62.170(D), the structure does not embody distinctive characteristics associated with any specific type, period, region, or method of construction. Additionally, the garage structure does not represent the work of an important creative individual, nor does it possess high artistic value. The design and construction of the accessory structure are simple and lack the unique features that would distinguish it as significant in an architectural or artistic context.

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

The accessory structure has not yielded, nor is it likely to yield, any information of significant value related to prehistory or history. A review of the property's historical context and physical condition indicates that it does not contain unique or important archaeological or historical resources. Based on the CEQA criteria in §15064.5 and supporting findings, the structure does not qualify as a historic resource under CEQA.

Therefore, the proposed demolition will not result in a substantial adverse change to the significance of any historical resource, as defined in §15064.5.

C) Conclusion of Analysis

Based on the criteria listed and their corresponding responses, staff has determined that the detached garage does not meet the criteria for historical significance under local or State guidelines.

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

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

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the information provided in this report, staff recommends that the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission approve Demolition No. 396 subject to the recommended Conditions of Approval.

MOTION

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

“I move that the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission adopt Resolution No. 2025-02, to determine that Demolition Permit No. 396 is exempt from environmental review under Section 15301 of the CEQA Guidelines for Existing Facilities, and approve Demolition Permit No. 396 based on the facts within this staff report and subject to the Conditions of Approval.”

ATTACHMENT "A"

Location Map and Aerial Photograph



City of Redlands
Location Map - 425 Cajon St

Author: Redlands GIS **Date:** 5/22/2025

Legend

City Boundary	Mentone
APN	Redlands
Incorporated Municipality	Unincorporated
Donut	Yucaipa
Loma Linda	

ATTACHMENT "B"

Site Photographs



Front (West)

Side (South)



ATTACHMENT "C"

Preliminary Environmental Checklist

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title: Demolition No. 396
2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
City of Redlands
Development Services Department
35 Cajon Street, Suite 20
Redlands, CA 92373
Mailing Address:
City of Redlands
Development Services Dept. – Planning
P.O. Box 3005
Redlands, CA 92373
3. Contact Person: Rosemary Montoya, Assistant Planner
4. Project Location: 425 Cajon Street (APN: 0173-051-07-0000)
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: Robert Lee c/o Fine Line Design, 563 Jefferson St, Redlands CA 92374
6. General Plan Designation: Office
7. Zoning Designation: Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District
8. Description of Project: The applicant is proposing to demolish an approximately 288 square foot accessory structure over 50 years of age located at 425 Cajon St (APN: 0173-051-07-0000) within the Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District. This proposal may qualify for exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 15301(l)(4) (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines.
9. Existing On-site Land Use and Setting The property is located easterly of Cajon Street, northerly of East Home Place, westerly of La Verne Street, southerly of East Fern Avenue. The site is currently improved with a single-family residence and the subject accessory structure used as a garage. The subject structure is located in the rear yard, on the northeast corner of the property.
10. The subject property and the surrounding parcels are developed with residential uses as listed below.

	GENERAL PLAN	ZONING	LAND USE
NORTH	Office	Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District	Multi-family Residential
SOUTH	Office	Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District	Single-family Residential
WEST	Office	Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District	Single-family Residential
EAST	Office	Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District	Single-family Residential

The site is located within the registered Early Redlands Historic and Scenic District (Historic

District No. 3). The subject property is not individually listed as a designated historic resource or landmark.

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

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



Rosemary Montoya, Assistant Planner
City of Redlands
June 5, 2025

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all determinations, except "No Impact" determinations that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" determination is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" determination should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All determinations and discussion must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be potentially significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries in any section of this Initial Study, then an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared to fully analyze the identified issue(s).
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (CEQA Guidelines Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In such cases, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For any effects that are determined to be "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist any and all references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., General Plan maps or exhibits, zoning ordinances, specific plans, etc.). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources. A source list should be attached, and other sources used, or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion. In this Initial Study, a References section is provided at the end of the document.

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats. However, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and,
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	—	—	<u>✓</u>	—
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

AESTHETICS – DISCUSSION

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway. The project is the demolition of an accessory structure that is not located within any scenic vista; therefore, no impact would occur.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not damage scenic resources, including trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings within a state scenic highway. The property is not located along a state scenic highway. The structure to be demolished is a garage, and there is no known rock outcropping on-site.
- c) *Less than significant Impact.* The proposed demolition of the garage will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The structure is in poor condition and lacks distinctive architectural features that significantly contribute to the visual character or aesthetic appeal of the neighborhood. Therefore, the demolition will result in a less than significant impact.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Lighting and glare will be reduced as a result of the demolition of this structure as any lights attached to the structure would be removed at the time of demolition.

ISSUES

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

II. AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES –

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----------|
| 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? | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |
| 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)? | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |

AGRICULTURE & FOREST RESOURCES – DISCUSSION

- a) *No Impact.* The project includes the demolition of a 288 square-foot garage. The property does not include any Prime Farmland and the Department of Conservation indicates that the site is located within the Urban and Built-Up Land zone. Therefore, the demolition will not convert any existing Prime Farmland or Unique Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use.
- b) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. The property is within the Administrative and Professional (A-P) District which is not intended for agricultural uses, and the property is not in contract under the Williamson Act provisions.
- c) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition is located in an area that is zoned for the development of residential uses. The property does not contain any forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production. As such, removal of the structure on the property will not create an impact on forest land or timberland.
- d) *No Impact.* The property does not contain any forest land, as it is developed with a residential structure. The surrounding area is also developed with residences and is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land. The project does not involve the conversion of any forest land or the clearing of any forested areas. Therefore, there will be no impact related to the loss of forest land or its conversion to non-forest use.
- e) *No Impact.* The 1908 Sanborn maps show that the property was, at that time, surrounded by residential development and some vacant parcels. Since that time, the surrounding area has been fully developed with residential dwellings, and there has been no indication of agricultural or forest land use within the property or its immediate vicinity. The property is located in an urbanized area, within the Urban and Built-Up Land zone as designated by the California Department of Conservation, further indicating that there are no agricultural or forest resources in the area. Therefore, the project will not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use.

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	—	—	<u>✓</u>	—

ISSUES

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

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	—	—	—	✓
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	—	—	—	✓
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	—	—	—	✓

AIR QUALITY – DISCUSSION

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. The project involves the demolition of a single accessory structure, which will comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures. The demolition activity will be localized and short-term in nature which would not significantly impact long-term air quality goals or plans. Therefore, no impact will occur in relation to this issue.
- b) *Less than Significant Impact.* The demolition activities will generate short-term, minor emissions such as dust and vehicle exhaust. However, these emissions are not expected to violate any air quality standards or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation. Given the scale and temporary nature of the project, air quality standards are not anticipated to be violated.
- c) *No Impact.* The demolition project is not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants. The project is small in scale and the emissions from this demolition will be temporary and minimal. Consequently, the project’s emissions will not exceed the threshold for cumulative air quality impacts.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Demolition activities associated with the proposed project may temporarily increase pollutant levels in the immediate vicinity; however, pollution levels are not anticipated to be substantial. All demolition activities associated with the project are required to comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures, no impact would occur.
- e) *No Impact.* This demolition is not expected to generate significant odors beyond the typical smells associated with construction. If hazardous materials are found, they would be properly remediated according to state and local guidelines. Therefore, it is unlikely that the demolition will result in objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

ISSUES

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? – Since Kangaroo rats are endangered in Redlands how can we determine they are not on this specific site? I checked the CA Dept of Fish and Wildlife Service map online and they only indicate that Kangaroo Rats are endangered in the general Redlands area.	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – DISCUSSION

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition of the 288 square-foot garage will take place within a fully developed urban area that is already characterized by residential structures. The site does not contain habitat for any special-status species, as the property is not known to support sensitive species or habitats that would be impacted by the demolition. This demolition will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications. All work completed will be required to adhere to all local, State, and Federal laws.
- b) *No Impact.* The property is located in an urbanized area and does not contain riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. There are no watercourses, wetlands, or sensitive habitats on-site that would be impacted by the demolition. No disturbance beyond the limits of the subject property is proposed. While Kangaroo Rats are known to be endangered in the Redlands area, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) map and available habitat data show that the site is not within a designated habitat area for this species. Based on the urbanized nature of the site and the lack of suitable habitat for Kangaroo Rats (such as open, undeveloped land with specific vegetation), no significant adverse effects are expected.
- c) *No Impact.* The project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, as it is an urbanized property with no evidence of marshes, vernal pools, or other types of wetlands. There are no water bodies or wetland areas on or near the site that could be impacted by the demolition.
- d) *No Impact.* The project includes the demolition of an existing accessory structure. The existing site conditions will remain the same. The demolition project will not interfere with wildlife movement, as the site is located within a fully developed urban area with no established wildlife corridors or migratory pathways. Additionally, the site does not support any native wildlife nursery sites. The project does not involve actions that would disrupt or fragment wildlife movement patterns in the area.
- e) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. No trees are proposed to be removed as a part of this application. Any removal of the trees is required to be done in compliance with all local, State, and Federal laws and compliance with existing regulations will ensure that no impact occurs in relation to this issue.
- f) *No Impact.* The project site is not located within the boundaries of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan, and there are no such plans that would apply to the site or surrounding area. Therefore, the project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plans or conservation strategies that are in place at the local, regional, or state level.

ISSUES

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5? — — ✓ —
- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5? — — — ✓
- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? — — — ✓
- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? — — — ✓

CULTURAL RESOURCES – DISCUSSION

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

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

Staff was unable to locate the original building permits for the accessory structure. The 1908 Sanborn map shows a detached accessory structure with the same building footprint and the structure is then labeled “auto” in the 1915 Sanborn map. However, the 1976 Historic Resources Inventory sheet indicates that this property does not have any related features, such as a barn, carriage house or shed. Based on research of local historical newspapers and building permits, the accessory structure is not linked to events of significant historical or cultural importance to California; it primarily functioned as a storage structure.

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

Staff conducted research at the A.K. Smiley Library Heritage Room and through newspaper.com. The table (shown below) lists the residents associated with the primary dwelling based on the information obtained from the City Directories located at the A.K. Smiley Library’s Heritage Room.

DIRECTORY YEAR	NAME(S)	OCCUPATION
1910	Alva B. Cowgill	Secretary at Redlands Mutual Orange Distributors Company
	Chester B. Cowgill	Student
	Miss Claire Cowgill	Teacher
	Mrs. Ethel M. Cowgill	Occupation not listed
	Mrs. Nellie D. Cowgill	Occupation not listed

1911	Alva B. Cowgill	Secretary and Manager at Redlands Mutual Orange Company
	Chester B. Cowgill	Student
	Miss Claire Cowgill	Teacher
	Mrs. Ethel M. Cowgill	Occupation not listed
	Ralph Cowgill	Student
1912	Alva B. Cowgill	Secretary and Manager at Redlands Mutual Orange Company
	Chester B. Cowgill	Student
	Miss Claire Cowgill	Teacher
	Ralph Cowgill	Student
1919	Chas S. Miller	Manager at Citrus Growers Cash Association
	Emma Miller	Occupation not listed
1921	Harmon Weaver	Occupation not listed
	Luella K. Weaver	Occupation not listed
1923	Harmon Weaver	Occupation not listed
	Luella K. Weaver	Occupation not listed
1925	Harmon Weaver	Occupation not listed
	Luella K. Weaver	Occupation not listed
1927	Harmon Weaver	Occupation not listed
	Luella K. Weaver	Occupation not listed
1929	Herman Ross	Occupation not listed
	Florence N. Ross	Occupation not listed
1931	Herman Ross	Occupation not listed
	Florence N. Ross	Occupation not listed
1933	Henry T. Simpson	Carpenter
	Nora C. Simpson	Occupation not listed
1936	Laura B. Haydon	Retired
1939	Laura B. Haydon	Retired
	Maurice Leon	Tailor at Fred C. Fowler
1941	Laura B. Haydon	Retired
	Maurice Leon	Salesman at Fred C. Fowler
	Roy L. Guin	Salesman at Gair's
	Milton Smith	Bookkeeper at Mitten's Display Letters
	Vester Wyatt	Public School Teacher
	Mrs. Etta M. Pollard	Homemaker

1947	Roy M. Powell	Painter at Woessner
1950	Herbert Wheeler	Retired
	Ellen Wheeler	Occupation not listed
	Mrs. Florence O'Neill	Dialogue Coach
	Mrs. Betty Russell	Secretary
1952	Herbert Wheeler	Retired
	Ellen Wheeler	Occupation not listed
	Mrs. Florence O'Neill	Beautician
	Betty Russell	Receptionist
1954	Herbert Wheeler	Retired
	Ellen Wheeler	Occupation not listed
1958	Herbert Wheeler	Retired
	Ellen Wheeler	Occupation not listed
1961	Philip J. Henry	Public School Teacher
	Mrs. Doris Henry	Bar Manager at Van De Kamp
1965	Philip J. Henry	Counselor at Fontana School District
	Mrs. Doris Henry	Demonstrator at Van De Kamp
Beginning of San Bernardino County Assessor's Record		
2001	Doris L Henry	Occupation details not available
2007	Doris L. Henry	Occupation details not available
2013	Estate of Doris L. Henry	Occupation details not available
2013	AEI Investments LLC	Occupation details not available
2014	Sarah Hudson	Occupation details not available
	Joe Hudson	Occupation details not available
2016	Hudson Family Revocable Trust	Occupation details not available
2020	Hudson Family Revocable Trust	Occupation details not available

The first recorded owners of the property were the Cowgill family, listed in the A.K. Smiley Library Directories from 1910-1912. Alva B. Cowgill served as secretary and manager of the Redlands Mutual Orange Company for 19 years and later its president. Later residents were employed in local businesses and office jobs, but there is no evidence they played a significant role in Redlands' social or cultural development.

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

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

The accessory building does not share the architectural style of the main dwelling. The structure has a simple design featuring an open gable roof with mounted solar panels and composite shingle roofing. The exterior is wood siding with vertical accent panels along the front elevation above the standard roll up garage door. The structure is covered by overgrown vines further detracting from any possible stylistic elements. It is not associated with a renowned architect, nor does it embody high artistic or architectural values. Therefore, the structure does not meet the criteria for historical significance under this section.

- iv. *Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information in prehistory or history. The structure has not yielded any information regarding prehistory or history.*

The structure and site have not yielded any significant archaeological or historical information based on available records. There is no evidence to suggest that the site holds the potential to reveal any important historical or prehistorical data. Due to the lack of historical artifacts or features of interest on the property, there is no expectation that the site would provide information of significance to California’s history or prehistory.

- b) *No Impact.* Based on a review of available records and the location of the property, there is no evidence to suggest the presence of significant archaeological resources on the site. The area has been heavily developed and disturbed by previous construction, reducing the likelihood of encountering archaeological resources. Therefore, the demolition will not cause a substantial adverse change to any archaeological resources, as no such resources are expected to exist on the site.
- c) *No Impact.* The project scope of work does not include any ground disturbance. The site is located within an urbanized area and does not contain any known paleontological resources or unique geological features. As such, the demolition of the garage will not directly or indirectly destroy any paleontological resources or unique geological features.
- d) *No Impact.* The property is located within a developed residential area, and there are no known cemeteries or areas associated with human remains on the property. A review of historical maps and resources does not indicate the presence of burial sites in the area. Therefore, the demolition project will not disturb any human remains.

ISSUES

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

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:

ISSUES	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 42.	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
iv. Landslides?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

GEOLOGY & SOILS – DISCUSSION

- a. *No Impact.* The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone, and there are no known active faults on the site. Although the area may experience seismic ground shaking due to regional seismic activity, the site is not susceptible to liquefaction or landslides. The project will adhere to standard building codes and engineering practices to mitigate any potential seismic or geologic risks. Therefore, the project will not expose people or structures to significant seismic or geologic hazards.
- b. *No Impact.* Disturbance within the project site will be limited to the immediate location surrounding the accessory structure and the site is not being cleared or graded as a result of this project. The proposed project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.
- c. *No Impact.* Based on General Plan 2035, the site is not located on an unstable geologic unit or soil that would result in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. The site is located within a developed area with stable soils that are not prone to instability. Therefore,

no adverse geologic impacts are expected.

- d. *No Impact.* The proposed project is not located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soil conditions on the site do not exhibit the characteristics of expansive soils, which could cause damage to structures. As a result, the project will not create risks associated with expansive soil.
- e. *No Impact.* The project will not involve the installation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, as the property is already connected to the municipal sewer system. The scope of the project involves demolishing an existing garage and does not include the need for septic tanks. Existing sewer lines are located on Cajon Street and any future project on this site would be required to connect to the existing sewer. Therefore, the project will not be impacted by soils that cannot support wastewater disposal systems.

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – DISCUSSION

- a-b) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition project is not expected to generate significant greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly. The emissions primarily come from temporary activities like vehicle and construction equipment use. These emissions will not have a substantial impact on the environment. Additionally, the project does not conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations aimed at reducing GHG emissions or local GHG reduction measures. Therefore, the project’s GHG emissions will be minimal and in compliance with relevant regulations.

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				

ISSUES:

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICAN T IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – DISCUSSION

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition project will not involve the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials in any significant way. The activities associated with demolition will be limited to standard construction processes and will not introduce hazardous materials that would pose a risk to the public or the environment. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, a demolition application shall be submitted to the City of Redlands Building and Safety Division for approval

per the regulations set forth in the California Building Code. Additionally, the demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.

- b) *No Impact.* The project will not result in the release of hazardous materials and there is no reasonable expectation of an accident that would lead to the release of hazardous materials. Standard construction procedures and safety protocols will be followed, minimizing any risk to public health or the environment. The demolition process shall comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.
- c) *No Impact.* The demolition does not involve hazardous materials or processes, there will be no risk of emitting hazardous materials or substances near any sensitive receptors, including schools. The nearest school is Kingsbury Elementary School which is approximately 0.3 miles from the subject property. The demolition process will be required to comply with Chapter 15.44 of the Redlands Municipal Code which regulates the demolition of structures and the abatement of hazardous materials.
- d) *No Impact.* The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. This was verified through the Envirostor and GeoTracker database, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- e) & f) *No Impact.* The site is not located within an existing airport land use plan. Therefore, the project will not create any safety hazards for people residing or working in the area due to airport-related concerns. The project is located approximately 3.1 miles southwest of the Redlands Municipal Airport and approximately 4.5 miles southeast from the San Bernardino International Airport. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.
- g) *No Impact.* The project will not impair or interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. The demolition is localized and will not obstruct access or create hazards that would impact emergency response or evacuation routes.
- h) *No Impact.* The site is located in an urbanized area with no wildland areas nearby. There is no significant risk of wildland fires in this region, and the proposed demolition will not expose people or structures to such a risk.

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY.				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

ISSUES:

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

local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunamis, or mudflow?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – DISCUSSION

- a) *No Impact.* The proposed demolition will not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Proper waste disposal procedures will be followed to ensure no pollutants or contaminants are discharged into local water systems.

- b) *No Impact.* The project does not involve activities that would deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. The scope of the project is limited to demolition and construction activities that would not have any significant effect on local groundwater resources or aquifers.
- c, d) *No Impact.* The project will not alter the existing drainage patterns of the site or the surrounding area. There are no streams or rivers near the project site, and the proposed demolition will not cause significant erosion or siltation.
- e, f) *No Impact.* The project will not alter existing drainage patterns, the course of any streams, or substantially increase surface runoff. The demolition does not involve significant grading or construction that would cause flooding either on- or off-site.
- g, h) *No Impact.* The proposed project will not place structures within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. The proposed project will not place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows.
- i) *No Impact.* The site is not located in a flood hazard area, and there is no risk of exposure to flooding due to levee or dam failure. The project is situated in an area where flooding risks are minimal.
- j) *No Impact.* The project is not located in an area subject to inundation by a seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. The site is situated in an inland urban area, far from coastal or seismic activity zones that could result in these types of natural disasters.

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
X. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

LAND USE & PLANNING – DISCUSSION

- a) *No Impact.* The project will not physically divide an established community. The proposed demolition and construction activities are consistent with the surrounding urban environment, and there are no changes that would disrupt or isolate portions of the community.

- b) *No Impact.* The project is in compliance with all applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations of the jurisdictional agencies. It does not conflict with the general plan, specific plan, zoning ordinance, or any other relevant land use regulations adopted to mitigate environmental effects.
- c) *No Impact.* The project does not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans. The site is not located within the boundaries of such plans, and the proposed activities will not negatively affect any conserved habitats or communities.

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

MINERAL RESOURCES – DISCUSSION

- a,b) *No Impacts.* The project will not result in the loss of availability of any known or locally important mineral resources. The site is not located within a designated mineral resource recovery area, nor is it identified as containing mineral resources of value to the region or state.

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
XII. NOISE – Would the project:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

NOISE – DISCUSSION

- a, b) *No Impact.* Noise generated during construction will be temporary, and mitigation measures, such as limiting work hours, will be employed to minimize the impact. Additionally, ground borne vibration or noise levels are not expected to exceed thresholds that would affect nearby sensitive receptors. No long-term adverse effects on noise levels or vibration are anticipated.
- c, d) *No Impact.* The project is not expected to cause a permanent or substantial increase in ambient noise levels. While temporary increases in noise may occur during demolition, such as from equipment use and other activities, these will be short-term and comply with local noise ordinances.
- e) *No Impact.* The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, there will be no exposure to excessive noise levels associated with airport operations.
- f) *No Impact.* The project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip. As a result, no exposure to excessive noise levels from airstrip operations is anticipated.

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
XIII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of road or other infrastructure)?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	—	—	—	✓
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	—	—	—	✓

POPULATION & HOUSING – DISCUSSION

a-f) *No Impacts.* The project is the demolition of a 288 square-foot garage. The project would not displace a significant amount of existing housing or people, nor does it induce substantial population growth in the area. There are no infrastructure expansions or new developments are proposed that would substantially increase population. Therefore, there is no need for the construction of replacement housing elsewhere and no impacts are anticipated as a result of the project.

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

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i) Fire protection?	—	—	—	✓
ii) Police protection?	—	—	—	✓
iii) Schools?	—	—	—	✓
iv) Parks?	—	—	—	✓
v) Other public facilities?	—	—	—	✓

PUBLIC SERVICES – DISCUSSION

a) The project does not require new or physically altered governmental facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios or performance objectives for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public services. The proposed demolition will not result in substantial adverse

physical impacts related to these public services, as no significant changes to service demands or facility requirements are anticipated. In terms of cumulative effects, the proposed project would not create any public services or facilities issues beyond that anticipated in the General Plan EIR. Therefore, no impacts will occur related to these issues.

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<hr/>				
XV. RECREATION – Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

RECREATION – DISCUSSION

a, b) *No Impact.* The project will not increase the use of existing neighborhoods or regional parks or other recreational facilities to a degree that would cause physical deterioration. Additionally, the project does not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that would have an adverse physical effect on the environment. No significant impacts to recreational resources are anticipated.

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
<hr/>				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

ISSUES:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION INCORPORATED	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
c) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>

TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – DISCUSSION

a-f) *No Impact.* The project is the demolition of an approximately 288 square-foot accessory structure. The project will not conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, or policies related to transportation effectiveness, including mass transit and non-motorized travel. It does not conflict with any congestion management program or level of service standards. The project will not result in changes to air traffic patterns, create safety risks due to design features, or obstruct emergency access. Additionally, there will be no conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, and no substantial hazards are expected.

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

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American	---	---	---	<u>✓</u>
--	-----	-----	-----	----------

ISSUES:

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

tribe, and that is:

i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k); or,

ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

—	—	—	✓
---	---	---	---

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – DISCUSSION

a. *No Impact.* The project does not involve any known tribal cultural resources, as defined by the Public Resources Code. There are no resources listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, nor are there any resources determined by the lead agency to be significant based on criteria set forth in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. Additionally, the project will not cause a substantial adverse change to any cultural resources important to California Native American tribes.

ISSUES:

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

XVIII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

—	—	—	✓
---	---	---	---

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?

—	—	—	✓
---	---	---	---

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?

—	—	—	✓
---	---	---	---

ISSUES:

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

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	—	—	—	<u>✓</u>

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – DISCUSSION

- a, b) *No Impact.* The project does not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. Additionally, it does not require the construction or expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities, and therefore, it will not result in significant environmental effects related to these systems.
- c) *No Impact.* The project is a demolition of an existing garage and does not require or result in the construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities. The demolition activities will not cause significant environmental effects related to stormwater systems.
- d) *No Impact.* The demolition project will have no impact on water supplies available. The proposed project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the needs of the demolition process. No new or expanded water entitlements are needed.
- e) *No Impact.* The demolition project includes the removal of an accessory structure. As such, the removal of the structure would not result in a need for additional capacity by the wastewater treatment provider (City of Redlands). Any future development of the property will be required to be reviewed to confirm that adequate capacity exists for the desired development. Future connection to sewer, as needed for any future development could be provided.
- f, g) *No Impact.* The proposed project will be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. The proposed project is the demolition of an accessory structure. Trash service for the primary residence onsite is provided by the City of Redlands which operates its own public landfill which has adequate capacity to continue to service the site. The proposed project will comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste and no impact will occur in relation to this issue.

ISSUES:

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

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|----------|
| <p>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p> | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |
| <p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</p> | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |
| <p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> | — | — | — | <u>✓</u> |

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE – DISCUSSION

- a. *No Impact.* The project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or harm local ecosystems. It will not substantially reduce wildlife habitat, threaten populations, or eliminate important historical or prehistoric resources. The site is not located within areas of significant wildlife habitat or cultural resources, and the project activities will not result in such impacts.
- b. *No Impact.* The project does not have cumulatively considerable impacts when considered with past, present, or future projects. The proposed demolition is localized and temporary, and no substantial environmental effects are anticipated that would combine with other developments to create significant cumulative impacts.
- c. *No Impact.* The project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. The proposed activities, including demolition and construction, will not result in risks to human health or safety. Proper procedures will be followed to ensure minimal disturbance to surrounding residents and businesses, and no indirect or direct impacts on human beings are anticipated.

REFERENCES

1. City of Redlands (2017, December 5). *City of Redlands 2035 General Plan*. Available online at: <https://www.cityofredlands.org/post/planning-division-general-plan>
2. San Bernardino County Assessor Records, "Property Information Management System." October 2024. Available online at: <http://www.sbcounty.gov/assessor/pims/PIMSINTERFACE.ASPX>
3. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. "National Wetlands Inventory." 10 February 2025. <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>
4. California Department of Conservation. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Available online at: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>
5. California Department of Toxic Substances Control. *EnviroStor Database*. Available online at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
6. California Department of Transportation. *California Scenic Highway Mapping System*. Available online at: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>
7. City of Redlands (2017, December 5). *City of Redlands Climate Action Plan*. Available online at: https://www.cityofredlands.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/final_redlands_cap_with_appendices_011718_0.pdf?1727749075
8. Historic Aerials. Available online at: <https://historicaerials.com/>
9. California State Geoportal. "California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer." 2020. Available online at: <https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414>
10. State Water Resources Control Board. "Geotracker." Available online at: https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/profile_report.asp?global_id=T0607100096
11. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. "National Wetlands Inventory." Available online at: <https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/>
12. City of Redlands, *City of Redlands List of Historic Resources (2 November 2023)*. Available online at: https://www.cityofredlands.org/sites/main/files/file-attachments/designated_historic_resources_11-02-2023.pdf?1698963146

ATTACHMENT "D"

Resolution No. 2025-02 with Exhibit A (Conditions of Approval)

RESOLUTION NO. 2025-02

A RESOLUTION OF THE HISTORIC AND SCENIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDLANDS APPROVING DEMOLITION NO. 396, TO DEMOLISH AN APPROXIMATELY 288 SQUARE-FOOT DETACHED GARAGE LOCATED AT 425 CAJON STREET (APN: 0173-051-07-0000).

WHEREAS, the applicant, Robert Lee, has submitted an application for Demolition Permit No. 396 to demolish an approximately 288 square-foot accessory structure over 50 years of age located at 425 Cajon Street (APN: 0173-051-07-0000) within the Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District; and

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

WHEREAS, on June 5, 2025 the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission held a public hearing and considered the staff report, oral report, the testimony and the written evidence submitted by and on behalf of the applicant and by members of the public; and

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

WHEREAS, following the public hearing for the Demolition, the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission determined that the structure does not have historical significance and is exempt from further environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act.

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

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

Section 2. The proposed demolition is hereby approved subject to the Conditions of Approval contained in Exhibit “A” attached to this Resolution.

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

ADOPTED, SIGNED AND APPROVED THIS 5th DAY OF JUNE, 2025.

Kurt Heidelberg, Chair, Historic
And Scenic Preservation Commission

ATTEST:

Sonya Flint, Secretary

I, Sonya Flint, Secretary to the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission of the City of Redlands, hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by the Historic and Scenic Preservation Commission at a regular meeting thereof held on the 5th day of June, 2025.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAINED:

Sonya Flint, Historic and Scenic
Preservation Commission Secretary

EXHIBIT A
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
DEMOLITION NO. 396

1. This approval is to demolish an approximately 288 square foot detached garage over 50 years of age located at 425 Cajon Street (APN: 0173-051-07-0000) within the Administrative and Professional Office (A-P) District.
2. Prior to commencing demolition activities, a building permit shall be obtained from the Building & Safety Division.
3. The issuance of any permits shall comply with all provisions of the Redlands Municipal Code, including Section 15.44 which regulates the demolition of structures.
4. Unless demolition has commenced pursuant to a building permit, this application shall expire eighteen (18) months from the approval date.
5. All demolition activities shall be limited to the hours from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday, and prohibited on Sundays and Federal holidays.
6. The applicant for this permit, and its successors and assigns, shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City of Redlands, and its elected officials, officers, agents and employees, from and against any and all claims, actions, and proceedings to attack, set aside, void or annul the approval of this permit by the City, or brought against the City due to acts or omissions in any way connected to the applicant's project that is the subject of this permit. This indemnification shall include, but not be limited to, damages, fees, costs, liabilities, and expenses incurred in such actions or proceedings, including damages for the injury to property or persons, including death of a person, and any award of attorneys' fees. In the event any such action is commenced to attack, set aside, void or annul all, or any, provisions of this permit, or is commenced for any other reason against the City for acts or omissions relating to the applicant's project, within fourteen (14) City business days of the same, the applicant shall file with the City a performance bond or irrevocable letter of credit (together, the "Security") in a form and in an amount satisfactory to the City, to ensure applicant's performance of its defense and indemnity obligations under this condition. The failure of the applicant to provide the Security shall be deemed an express acknowledgement and agreement by the applicant that the City shall have the authority and right, without objection by the applicant, to revoke all entitlements granted for the project pursuant to this permit. The City shall have no liability to the applicant for the exercise of City's right to revoke this permit.