RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PALO
ALTO AMENDING THE LAND USE MAP OF THE PALO ALTO
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO ASSIGN THE "LIGHT
INDUSTRIAL" LAND USE DESIGNATION TO 1.81 ACRES
OF LAND AT 1001 SAN ANTONIO ROAD

WHEREAS, the Planning and Transportation Commission
("Commission"), after a duly noticed public hearing on
September 19, 2007, has recommended that the Land Use Map of the
Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan be amended to assign the "Light
Industrial" land use designation to 1.81 acres of land at 1001
San Antonio Road; and

WHEREAS, the Council has held a duly noticed public
hearing on the matter on February 11, 2008, and has reviewed the
Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the project and all
other relevant information, including staff reports, and all
testimony, written and oral, presented on the matter.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Council of the City of Palo Alto
does hereby RESOLVE, as follows:

SECTION 1. The Council finds that the public interest,
health and welfare of Palo Alto and the region require an
amendment to the Land Use Map of the Palo Alto Comprehensive
Plan as set forth in Section 2.

SECTION 2. The Council hereby amends the Land Use Map
of the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan to designate 1.81 acres of
land at 1001 San Antonio Road, "Light Industrial", as shown on
Attachment A attached hereto and incorporated herein by
reference.

SECTION 3. This resolution shall be effective on the 31st
day after its adoption. This delayed effective date is intended
and shall be construed to provide a sufficient period of time
between adoption of the resolution and its effective date to allow
a complete and exclusive opportunity for the exercise of the
referendum power pursuant to the Charter of the City of Palo Alto
and the Constitution of the State of California. A referendum
petition filed after the effective date shall be rejected as
untimely.

SECTION 4. The Council hereby finds that this new land
use designation will have no significant effect on the
environment.
INTRODUCED AND PASSED:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Assistant City Attorney

APPROVED:

Mayor

City Manager

Director of Planning and Community Environment
ORDINANCE

ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PALO ALTO
REZONING APPROXIMATELY 1.81 ACRES OF CALTRANS-
OWNED LAND, LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF
CALTRANS RIGHT-OF-WAY AT SAN ANTONIO AVENUE AND
U.S. 101 (BAYSHORE FREEWAY) NORTH OF THE TERMINUS OF
TRANSORT ROAD, FROM PUBLIC FACILITIES DISTRICT (PF)
TO GENERAL MANUFACTURING DISTRICT (GM) FOR 1001 SAN
ANTONIO AVENUE (CIARDELLA’S)

The Council of the City of Palo Alto does ORDAIN as follows:

SECTION 1. The City Council finds as follows:

A. The Planning and Transportation Commission ("Commission"), after a duly
noticed public hearing on September 19, 2007, has recommended that the City Council of the
City of Palo Alto ("Council") rezone the 1.81 acres of land at 1001 San Antonio Avenue at the
southwest corner of the CalTrans right-of-way at San Antonio Avenue and U.S. Highway 101
(Bayshore Freeway), north of Transport Road from “Public Facilities (PF)” to “General
Manufacturing (GM)”;

B. The Council has received the facts presented at the public hearing, including
public testimony and reports and recommendations from the director of planning and community
environment or other appropriate city staff;

D. The Council finds that a change in the Zoning Map from Public Facilities
(PF) to General Manufacturing (GM) is consistent with the zoning of adjacent lands also having
frontage on Transport Road and San’ Antonio Avenue and extension of the GM zoning will
enable the property owner (Caltrans) to lease State property to a long-standing private business
and thereby retain the business within City limits, subject to completion of architectural review
and compliance with the GM regulations, which require all uses to be conducted in such a
manner as to preclude any nuisance, hazard, or commonly recognized offensive conditions;

E. The Council finds that rezoning the parcel to General Manufacturing District
(GM) is in accord with the Light Industrial land use designation proposed for the site as defined
in the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan (PACP), amended pursuant to the accompanying
resolution, in that the site is within the San Antonio Avenue industrial area referenced in the
PACP’s land use definition of Light Industrial, which, similar to the GM zone requirements,
indicates that emission of fumes, noise, smoke or other pollutants is strictly controlled and limits
the floor area ratio to .5:1.

F. The Council has held a duly noticed public hearing on the matter on
October 22, 2007, and has reviewed the Negative Declaration prepared for the project and all
other relevant information, including staff reports, and all testimony, written and oral, presented
on the matter.
NOT YET APPROVED

SECTION 2. The Council hereby amends the Zoning Map of the City of Palo Alto to place 1001 San Antonio Avenue, 1.81 acres of land, within the “General Manufacturing District (GM).”

SECTION 3. The Council hereby finds that this rezoning will have no significant effect on the environment and approves the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

SECTION 4. This ordinance shall be effective upon the thirty-first (31st) day after its passage and adoption.

INTRODUCED:

PASSED:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTENTIONS:

ABSENT:

ATTEST:

APPROVED:

__________________________
City Clerk

__________________________
Mayor

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________
City Manager

__________________________
Director of Planning and Community Environment

Assistant City Attorney
TO: HONORABLE CITY COUNCIL
FROM: CITY MANAGER
DATE: OCTOBER 22, 2007
SUBJECT: ADOPTION OF A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION; ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION APPROVING A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION OF LIGHT INDUSTRIAL (NO DESIGNATION CURRENTLY EXISTS); AND ADOPTION OF AN ORDINANCE REZONING APPROXIMATELY 1.8 ACRES OF CALTRANS-OWNED LAND, LOCATED AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF THE CALTRANS RIGHT-OF-WAY AT SAN ANTONIO AVENUE AND U.S. 101 (BAYSHORE FREEWAY) NORTH OF THE TERMINEUS OF TRANSPORT ROAD, FROM PUBLIC FACILITIES DISTRICT (PF) TO GENERAL MANUFACTURING (GM) FOR 1001 SAN ANTONIO ROAD (CIARDELLA'S)

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff and the Planning and Transportation Commission recommend the City Council:

1. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration (Attachment F);

2. Adopt by Resolution a Comprehensive Plan designation of Light Industrial where no Comprehensive Plan land use designation currently exists (Attachment A); and

3. Rezone the 1.81-acre site from Public Facilities (PF) to General Manufacturing (GM) by adopting the attached ordinance (Attachment B).

BACKGROUND:
The proposal is a request by Ciardella's to rezone from the PF to the GM zone district the area located at the north terminus of Transport Road, in the existing Caltrans right-of-way, known as 1001 San Antonio Road. The rezoning would also require a Comprehensive Plan land use designation change to Light Industrial. CalTrans has leased the subject land to Ciardella's, a local garden supply center, in anticipation of the zone change.

Previously, Ciardella's was located at 2027 East Bayshore Road, land owned by the Santa Clara Valley Water District and leased to Ciardella's. Additional background information and
discussion is included in the attached Planning and Transportation Commission (P&TC) staff report. The City’s pump station project implementation required Ciardella’s to move from their previous location by September 2007. In order to assist the business and avoid downtime, staff scheduled P&TC meetings in advance of receiving the application and the required Caltrans correspondence, received September 9, 2007.

COMMISSION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS
On April 11, 2007, the P&TC initiated rezoning of the site and the amendment of the Comprehensive Plan. On September 19, 2007, the P&TC reviewed the proposal. The P&TC voted 6-0 (with Tuma not participating) to recommend that the City Council approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration with amendments as stated during the P&TC meeting and the requested land use designation and zone change as recommended by staff. The staff report and minutes of the PTC meeting are attached (Attachments D and E).

The attorney for the adjacent property owner at 4007-4009 Transport Road stated her belief that there had not been adequate environmental review. Her concerns focused on dust, traffic and drainage impacts that could potentially affect her clients’ property. She indicated that a full traffic study should be conducted and that neither CalTrans nor the City has adequately addressed drainage on the site. Staff responded that the appropriate study was prepared and adequate mitigation measures are provided.

The P&TC discussed with the applicant the extent of the work that has been done on the site and the applicant’s current use of the site. Caltrans had been leasing the San Antonio site to a contractor and had authorized grading and placement of base rock on the site. The applicant stated that site work was done with the approval and oversight of CalTrans and that additional work will be performed in response to the requirements of the City, and that the materials had been moved to the site approximately two weeks prior to the meeting.

Subsequent to the hearing, code enforcement staff visited the site and ascertained that the business had begun operating on the site contrary to staff’s direction to the applicant. A code enforcement letter demanding cessation of all commercial activities was issued October 4, 2007 (Attachment C). Upon approval of the rezoning request, mitigation measures set forth in the environmental document prepared for the rezoning (Attachment F) would be imposed upon the applicant.

RESOURCE IMPACT
Changing the zoning of the proposed site will allow Ciardella’s to operate on the site and remain a local Palo Alto enterprise, retaining sales tax generated by the business in Palo Alto.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS
The proposed change in the Zoning Map is consistent with the zoning of adjacent lands that also have frontage on Transport Road and San Antonio Avenue. The extension of the GM zoning will enable the property owner (Caltrans) to lease state property to a long-standing private business, subject to completion of architectural review and compliance with the GM regulations, which require all uses to be conducted in such a manner as to preclude any nuisance, hazard, or commonly recognized offensive conditions. The GM zoning is in accord with the Light
Industrial land use designation proposed for the site as defined in the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan (PACP). The site is within the San Antonio Road industrial area referenced in the Comprehensive Plan’s land use definition of Light Industrial, which, similar to the GM zone requirements, indicates that emission of fumes, noise, smoke or other pollutants is strictly controlled and limits the floor area ratio to 0.5:1.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
The attached Mitigated Negative Declaration (Attachment F) was prepared for the rezoning and land use designation, which is intended to allow Ciardella’s as a permitted use. Therefore, the environmental document addresses some specific concerns related to Ciardella’s use of the site, with mitigation measures that include a requirement for the applicant to complete the architectural review process to ensure the site modifications meet City codes, standards and required findings. The mitigation measures were designed to mitigate on-site and off-site nuisances related to business operations.

ATTACHMENTS
Attachment A: Resolution Amending Land Use Map
Attachment B: Ordinance Amending the Zoning Map
Attachment C: Code Enforcement Letter
Attachment D: PTC Staff Report, September 19, 2007 with Table 1, map and applicant letter
Attachment E: PTC Meeting Minutes, September 19, 2007
Attachment F: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study, September 26, 2007

PREPARED BY:  

[Signature]
Stephen O’Connell  
Contract Planner

DEPARTMENT HEAD:

[Signature]
Steve Emstie  
Director of Planning and Community Environment

CITY MANAGER APPROVAL:

[Signature]
Emily Harrison  
Assistant City Manager

COURTESY COPIES:
Larry Ciardella, President of Ciardella’s
Bob Budelli, Vice President of Ciardella’s
Nicolas P. Jellins, Esq.
Elizabeth Bridges, Esq.
Jim Bozionelos, CalTrans, Division of Right of Way
Peter Gilli, Deputy Zoning Administrator, City of Mountain View
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
City of Palo Alto
Department of Planning and Community Environment

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Request by Ciardella’s Garden Supply on behalf of Caltrans to establish Ciardella’s Garden Supply Center on 1.98 acres of land via City approval of the following applications: (1) A Rezoning of the site from Public Facilities District (PF) to General Manufacturing District (GM); (2) A Comprehensive Plan Amendment to apply a land use designation of Light Industrial (no designation currently exists); and (3) Architectural Review of site modifications.

1. PROJECT TITLE
Rezoning and Land Use Designation of 1001 San Antonio Avenue
Palo Alto, California

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS
City of Palo Alto
Department of Planning and Community Environment
250 Hamilton Ave.
Palo Alto, CA 94303

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER
Amy French
Manager of Current Planning
City of Palo Alto
650-329-2552

4. PROJECT SPONSOR’S NAME AND ADDRESS
Ciardella’s Garden Supply on behalf of
State of California Department of Transportation
111 Grand Avenue
Oakland, CA 94612

5. APPLICATION NUMBER
07-PLN-00276 and 07-PLN-00344

6. PROJECT LOCATION
Caltrans Property
1001 San Antonio Avenue
Palo Alto

The project site is Caltrans property located at 1001 San Antonio Avenue at the southwest corner of the CalTrans right-of-way at San Antonio Avenue and U.S. Highway 101 (Bayshore Freeway), north of Transport Road.
7. **GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:**
There is no existing General Plan land use designation for the site. The proposed designation is Light Industrial.

8. **ZONING**
The site is zoned Public Facilities, regulated by the Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) Chapter 18.32. The proposed zoning, GM (General Manufacturing) is regulated by PAMC Chapter 18.20.

9. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**
The project is the rezoning from Public Facilities District (PF) to General Manufacturing District (GM) for approximately 1.98 acres of land at 1001 San Antonio Avenue, and site modifications, to establish Ciardella’s Garden Supply, considered a “general business service,” on the site. Additionally, the project includes approval of a resolution for a comprehensive plan land use designation of Light Industrial for these lands, which currently have no designation. Physical improvements associated with non-public use of the Caltrans site include the placement and or relocation of bulk storage bins (approximately 36 bins formed of concrete “lego blocks”), dry goods containers (approximately 3 containers), perimeter screening fences and boxed trees, a trailer to serve as a “modular office and showroom”, and areas for employee parking (10 spaces) and customer parking (10 spaces including one handicapped space), a generator, areas for pavers and stone pallets, and 15 parking spaces for tenants of the adjacent property at 4007 Transport Road. Site grading and application of base rock previously installed under Caltrans’ oversight is subject to meeting City standards for drainage and any related conditions of ARB approval. The 10’6” tall trailer is to have its floor at 2’9” above grade, for an overall height of 13’3” above finished grade, and an accessible ramp is proposed on the northeast elevation. The driveway, at a width of 30 feet, is designed to allow ingress from the one-way San Antonio Avenue and egress onto Transport Road, with a 110’ wide vehicle turnaround capacity provided on the site.

10. **SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING**
The property is surrounded on two sides (north and northeast) by lands owned by the State of California and in use as Highway 101 right of way areas, and on another two sides (west and south) by San Antonio Road. To the east immediately adjacent to the project site is 4007-4009 Transport Street, developed with a commercial building.

11. **OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES**
- County of Santa Clara, Office of the County Clerk-Recorder
- State of California, Department of Transportation

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question.
   [A "No Impact" answer 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" answer 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 answers 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 significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4) “(Mitigated) 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 17, “Earlier Analysis,” may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analysis 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. Section 15063 (C)(3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis 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 effects that are “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 references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). 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.

8) 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.
DISCUSSION OF IMPACTS

The following Environmental Checklist was used to identify environmental impacts, which could occur if the proposed project is implemented. The left-hand column in the checklist lists the source(s) for the answer to each question. The sources cited are identified at the end of the checklist. Discussions of the basis for each answer and a discussion of mitigation measures that are proposed to reduce potential significant impacts are included.

A. AESTHETICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on a public view or view corridor?</td>
<td>1, 2-Map L4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>1, 2-Map L4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Violate existing Comprehensive Plan policies regarding visual resources?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Substantially shadow public open space (other than public streets and adjacent sidewalks) between 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. from September 21 to March 21?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

The requested approvals would allow Ciardella’s to operate a garden supply business on the site.

The plans will be reviewed by the City’s Architectural Review Board (ARB) on December 20, 2007. With architectural review by the City staff and ARB, standard conditions of approval will ensure that site modifications will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings, and the project will have a less than significant visual impact.

The project plans dated 11/26/07 indicate the following visual improvements from existing conditions:

1) Existing, unattractive views of the site from Transport Road due to the placement of a 24’ x 60’ modular office on site will be mitigated by (a) the relocation of the modular office, and (b) the provision of a double-screened, ten foot high fence that would run approximately 185 feet in
total alongside the trailer parallel to the southeasterly edge of the site and bending to meet the existing fence that connects to the vehicle gate at the driveway. The modular office is necessarily a temporary structure, per CalTrans requirements. It is shown in plans as adjusted to align its short side with the front wall of the building on the adjacent site at 4007-4009 Transport Road. In addition to the 10 foot fence, seven, 36” box sized trees are proposed to be placed between the modular office and the proposed 10 foot tall fence to provide additional screening for the tenants of the building at 4007 Transport Road;

2) The existing, screened fence adjacent to San Antonio Avenue (the one-way “spur” road) and vehicle gate at the southerly edge of the site will remain, as will the existing elm tree(s), and six new 36” box trees will be placed along this frontage, alternating between cedar and redwood species. This will improve views of the site from the spur road;

3) A new, six foot tall, screened perimeter fence is proposed along the north, southwesterly and northeasterly edges of the site, and sixteen, 36” box trees will be placed along the north and southwest edges of the site, alternating between cedar and redwood species. Existing trees outside the perimeter edges of the site along the westerly, northerly and northeasterly edge of the site will contribute to the screening efforts, and an existing elm tree within the business area is proposed to be retained, which will provide additional visual benefit; and

4) A wall sconce is shown above each of the two doors, which are located on the front and rear elevations of the trailer. The proposed illumination is 100 watt fluorescent flood light, for security purposes. It is not anticipated that site lighting would create a significant impact, as standard conditions of ARB approval require lighting fixtures to be downward directional to prevent significant light pollution offsite.

**Mitigation Measures: None required**

**B. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources Would the project:</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1, 91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>1, 9, 2-MapL-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The site is not located in a “Prime Farmland”, “Unique Farmland”, or “Farmland of Statewide Importance” area, as shown on the maps prepared for the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program.
of the California Resources Agency. The site is not zoned for agricultural use, and is not regulated by the Williamson Act.

**Mitigation Measures:** None

### C. AIR QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct with implementation of the applicable air quality plan (1982 Bay Area Air Quality Plan &amp; 2000 Clean Air Plan)?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation indicated by the following:</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Direct and/or indirect operational emissions that exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) criteria air pollutants of 80 pounds per day and/or 15 tons per year for nitrogen oxides (NO), reactive organic gases (ROG), and fine particulate matter of less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Contribute to carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations exceeding the State Ambient Air Quality Standard of nine parts per million (ppm) averaged over eight hours or 20 ppm for one hour (as demonstrated by CALINE4 modeling, which would be performed when a) project CO emissions exceed 550 pounds per day or 100 tons per year; or b) project traffic would impact intersections or roadway links operating at Level of Service (LOS) D, E or F or would cause LOS to decline to D, E or F; or c) project would increase traffic volumes on nearby roadways by 10% or more)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Probability of contracting cancer for the Maximally Exposed Individual (MEI) exceeds 10 in one million</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Ground-level concentrations of non-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources Would the project:</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carcinogenic TACs would result in a hazard index greater than one (1) for the MEI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Not implement all applicable construction emission control measures recommended in the <em>Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines</em>?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

- The City of Palo Alto uses the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) thresholds of significance for air quality impacts.

Construction Impacts: The rezoning would allow for the use of the site for general business services. Associated with this rezoning is the establishment of Ciardella’s Garden Supply, which would involve grading and other activities which could cause localized dust related impacts resulting in increases in particulate matter (PM₁₀). The creation of the garden supply center on the site would be subject to the City’s standard conditions of approval related to dust control.

The following controls shall be implemented for the duration of project construction to minimize dust related construction impacts:

- All active construction areas shall be watered at least twice daily.
- All trucks hauling soil, sand, and loose materials shall be covered or shall retain at least two feet of freeboard.
- All paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at the construction site shall be swept and watered daily.
- Submit a plan for the recovery/recycling of demolition waste and debris before the issuance of a demolition permit.
- Sweep streets daily if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

Dust related impacts from construction are considered potentially significant but may be mitigated with the application of the standard dust control measures listed above. Construction equipment would also emit NOₓ and ROC. However, in order for emissions from construction equipment to be considered significant, the project must involve the extensive use of construction equipment over a long period of time. Based on the size of the proposed project, emissions of NOₓ and ROC are anticipated to be less than significant.

Long Term Impacts: Long-term project emissions would stem from motor vehicles and from storage and transport of materials associated with the use of the site by Ciardella’s as a garden supply center. As
discussed in the Transportation/Traffic section of this Initial Study, use of the site by Ciardella’s is not expected to result in a significant number of new vehicle trips. Long-term air-quality impacts from traffic are expected to be less than significant.

Since all work on the site is to be temporary, in accordance with Caltrans requirements, the applicants are not authorized to provide a solid wall or fence. The proposal includes placement of a double-screen, 10 foot tall fence, evergreen trees, removal of the drive aisle adjacent to the 4007 Transport Road property and replacement with an approximately 30 foot buffer from Ciardella’s parking facilities, to allow for any parking that may be desired by the tenants at 4007 Transport Road. In addition, the plans indicate the storage of pallets for pavers and stone in the area where formerly compost bins had been located near 4007 Transport Road. It is believed the proximity of the compost to 4007 Transport Road had created dust issues for the paper business at that location. The compost bins are to be relocated far from the paper business. The above provisions are designed to mitigate dust and odor issues for 4007 Transport Road to less than significant.

The remainder of the site’s perimeter is to receive six foot tall screening fences and evergreen trees. The perimeter fences and tree plantings would be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board. It is anticipated the screened fences would reduce the amount of wind blown dust emissions leaving the site, along with the installation of sprinklers at the end of the storage bins to provide regular watering. This would be a condition of ARB approval. Water service is available on the site. Impacts from dust produced in association with stored and transported materials would be reduced to an insignificant level (virtually no fugitive emissions) with proper watering. Ciardella’s currently minimize the free fall distance of transferred materials and intends to continue this practice. Ciardella’s currently covers all truck loads in an appropriate manner and removes soil from vehicles and equipment leaving the site and intends to continue to do so. There is a gravel bed on the Caltrans site. Project plans include civil engineering plans that provide a dust control note and indicate a rocked construction entrance 12 feet wide by 50 feet long, and other erosion control measures including sandbags and a construction fence with erosion prevention cover, which should also mitigate dust issues to less than significant. Nevertheless, the mitigation measures #1, 2 and 3 below are attached to the project to ensure less than significant impacts.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure #1:** In order to reduce wind blown dust emissions, the applicant shall (a) cover and install wind breaks around and covers on dirt piles and other stockpiled particulate matter, (b) water and/or employ soil stabilizers, (c) incorporate the use of non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturer’s specifications to all inactive areas of the site, including all unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas. When water is used, a water spray system shall be installed, moisture content in soil and other particulate stockpiles shall be high enough to eliminate PM-10 “fugitive” emissions (wind-blown dust that could otherwise escape into the surrounding air) and concrete debris shall be kept damp on the surface.

**Mitigation Measure #2:** City standard conditions for minimization of dust during construction shall be in effect for duration of the operations of Ciardella’s on the subject site. Truck loads of dirt, sand or other loose material shall be covered as required, any transfer processes involving a free fall of soil or
other particulate matter shall be operated in such a manner as to minimize the free fall distance and fugitive dust emissions, and active work areas (e.g. where soil handling is underway) shall be watered at least twice daily and more frequently as needed to prevent generation of dust. If soil material is carried out onto the public right of way, Ciardella’s will be required to address the problem.

Mitigation Measure #3: The applicant shall designate a person or persons responsible for Ciardella’s dust control measures, and clearly post on the exterior wall or fence of the facilities a company telephone number for citizens to call with dust, noise, or other operational complaints.

### D. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources Would the project:</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapN1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, including 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?</td>
<td>1,2-MapN1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 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?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapN1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or as defined by the City of Palo Alto’s Tree Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code Section 8.10)?</td>
<td>1,3,6, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The project site includes several existing trees and the Elms and Cedars within the area to be used for Ciardella’s are proposed to be retained and protected. It has not been found by Caltrans, in
conjunction with their environmental analysis of the site, that there is tree habitat on the land area surrounding the project site for the candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the area. No endangered, threatened, or rare animals, insects and plant species have been identified at this site by Caltrans. The establishment of Ciardella’s on the site is not anticipated to have any adverse impact on biological resources and will require no mitigation. Project plans include a landscape plan that provides for protection of existing trees and strategic placement of new trees in boxes for screening purposes. Per the standard approval conditions of architectural review approval, the project would result in a less than significant impact to biological resources.

Mitigation Measures: None

E. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Directly or indirectly destroy a local cultural resource that is recognized by City Council resolution?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?</td>
<td>1, 2-MapL8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>1,2-MapL8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>1,2-MapL8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Adversely affect a historic resource listed or eligible for listing on the National and/or California Register, or listed on the City’s Historic Inventory?</td>
<td>1,2-MapL7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

The Comprehensive Plan indicates that the site is in a moderate archaeological resource sensitivity zone. Most of the City area east of Interstate 280 is designated in this zone. Although existing and historic development has altered the native landscape, the potential exists that now-buried Native American sites could be uncovered in future planning area construction.

If archaeological materials are discovered the applicant would be required to perform additional testing and produce an Archaeological Monitoring and Data recovery Plan (AMDRP) to be approved prior to the start of construction.
Mitigation Measures: None

F. GEOLOGY, SOILS AND SEISMICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>2-MapN-5, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>2-MapN-7, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>2-MapN5, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Landslides?</td>
<td>2-MapN5, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in substantial siltation?</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 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?</td>
<td>2-MapN5, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 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?</td>
<td>2-MapN5, 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>1, 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or property to major geologic hazards that cannot be mitigated through the use of standard engineering design and seismic safety techniques?</td>
<td>1, 5, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:

The entire state of California is in a seismically active area. According to the Comprehensive Plan the project site is not in an area that is subject to very strong ground shaking in the event of an earthquake or in an area subject to expansive soils, surface rupture, liquefaction, or earthquake induced landslides.

Development of the site would be required to conform to all requirements in the Uniform Building Code, which includes provisions to ensure that the design and construction of all buildings includes provisions to resist damage from earthquakes to the extent feasible and acceptable. The potential onsite exposure to geological hazards is anticipated to be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

Substantial or permanent changes to the site topography are not expected. Grading and storage of materials on site has been authorized by Caltrans. Standard conditions of approval require submittal of a final grading and drainage plan for the project for approval by the Public Works Department prior to the issuance of any building permit. The application of standard grading, drainage, and erosion control measures as a part of the approved grading and drainage plan is expected to avoid any grading-related impacts.

The project will not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

Mitigation Measures:

None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routing transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Construct a school on a property that is subject to hazards from hazardous materials contamination, emissions or accidental release?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>1, 2-MapN9,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the public or the environment?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working the project area?</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>1,2-MapN7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>2-MapN7</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment from existing hazardous materials contamination by exposing future occupants or users of the site to contamination in excess of soil and ground water cleanup goals developed for the site?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The proposed project will not involve the handling, transportation, use, disposal, or emission of hazardous materials. The project site is not identified by either the California Environmental Protection Agency or the California State Water Resources Control Board as a hazardous materials site. The project is not expected to pose airport-related safety hazards. The proposed project will not interfere with either emergency response or evacuation. The project site is not located in a designated fire hazard area.

**Mitigation Measures:**

None

### II. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>1,2,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production</td>
<td>2-MapN2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1,2,5,6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1,2,5,6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>1,2,5,6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>2-MapN6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involve flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam or being located within a 100-year flood hazard area?</td>
<td>2-MapN6 N8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>2-MapN6, N8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k)</td>
<td>Result in stream bank instability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The project plans include civil drawings providing for erosion control, appropriate re-grading and the addition of drainage swales to ensure water will not sheet off the site onto the property at 4007 Transport Road and to ensure water will be directed to storm drainage on the southerly edge of the site and the drainage basin off site at the northwesterly edge of the Caltrans site. Though recent site improvements were analyzed and authorized by Caltrans, who reviewed erosion control plans and measures to ensure that during demolition, grading and construction, no storm water pollution could result, the City Public Works Engineering staff have reviewed the plans for consistency with the City’s requirements and standard conditions of architectural review approval would require the incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for storm water pollution prevention in all construction operations, in conformance with the Santa Clara Valley Non-Point Source Pollution Control Program, and submittal of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) in conjunction with building permit plans to address potential water quality impacts. City development standards and standard conditions of project approval would reduce potential negative impacts of the project to less than significant.
The project site is not located in an area of groundwater recharge, and will not deplete groundwater supplies. The project site is located in a 100-year flood hazard area but would not impede or redirect flood flows. The project site is not in an area that is subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

**Mitigation Measures:**

**Mitigation Measure #4:** The project will incorporate BMPs, including specific performance standards and if such standards are not met the City and Ciardella's will reevaluate and impose additional mitigation as needed to and as may be appropriate to ensure that performance criteria are met.

### I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1,2,3,6</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially adversely change the type or intensity of existing or planned land use in the area?</td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Be incompatible with adjacent land uses or with the general character of the surrounding area, including density and building height?</td>
<td>1,2,3,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with established residential, recreational, educational, religious, or scientific uses of an area?</td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Convert prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance (farmland) to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The proposed project is the rezoning and assignment of a land use designation to the subject property, for the purpose of allowing Caltrans to lease the land to Ciardella's Garden Supply as a General Business Service, and the site modifications to enable Ciardella's to officially open their business on the site. Ciardella's, under Caltrans' authorization, has stored materials on the site. Once the site has been successfully rezoned, Ciardella's business may operate on the site. The provision of offsite parking for
the businesses at 4007 Transport Road will be subject to securing a Conditional Use Permit from the City of Palo Alto.

**Mitigation Measures:**

None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. MINERAL RESOURCES</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The City of Palo Alto has been classified by the California Department of Conservation (DOC), Division of Mines and Geology (DMG) as a Mineral Resource Zone 1 (MRZ-1). This designation signifies that there are no aggregate resources in the area. The DMG has not classified the City for other resources. There is no indication in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan that there are locally or regionally valuable mineral resources within the City of Palo Alto.

**Mitigation Measures:**

None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K. NOISE</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibrations or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Cause the average 24 hour noise level (Ldn) to increase by 5.0 decibels (dB) or more in an existing residential area, even if the Ldn would remain below 60 dB?</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Cause the Ldn to increase by 3.0 dB or more in an existing residential area, thereby causing the Ldn in the area to exceed 60 dB?</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Cause an increase of 3.0 dB or more in an existing residential area where the Ldn currently exceeds 60 dB?</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Result in indoor noise levels for residential development to exceed an Ldn of 45 dB?</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Result in instantaneous noise levels of greater than 50 dB in bedrooms or 55 dB in other rooms in areas with an exterior Ldn of 60 dB or greater?</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Generate construction noise exceeding the daytime background Leq at sensitive receptors by 10 dBA or more?</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The project site is located in an area with an existing noise level of 75 Ldn adjacent to major roadways and industrial sites. The sound level of the proposed generator is 65 dB at 23 feet from the site’s southeasterly edge. The generator noise would be a less than significant impact. Construction and business operation activities may result in temporary increases in local ambient noise levels. Typical noise sources would include mechanical equipment associated with further grading and construction, which would be short term in duration. Standard approval conditions would require the project to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance (PAMC Chapter 9.10), which restricts the timing and overall noise levels associated with construction activity. Short-term construction that complies with the Noise Ordinance would result in impacts that are expected to be less than significant. Long term noise may be produced by trucks hauling materials on and off the site, associated with Ciardella’s Garden Supply operations. The City’s standard conditions of approval will be applied to the project to ensure the impacts will be reduced to a level of insignificance. The project site is not located within an airport land...
use plan or within the vicinity of a private airstrip, nor adjacent to residential uses. The site is adjacent to a General Manufacturing Zone district.

Mitigation Measures:

None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L. POPULATION AND HOUSING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a substantial imbalance between employed residents and jobs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Cumulatively exceed regional or local population projections?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION:

The rezoning could result in the use of the land for any of the permitted uses under the GM zoning, subject to Caltrans approval of a lease. This small amount of site area adjacent to the freeway is not conducive to residential use and will not induce population growth. No mitigation is necessary.

Mitigation Measures:

None.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M. PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Issues and Supporting Information Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION:

The proposed project would not impact fire service to the area and the site is not located in a high fire hazard area. The conditions of approval for the Architectural Review application would contain requirements to address all fire prevention measures. The site is located within the jurisdiction of the Palo Alto Police Department. The facility would not by itself result in the need for additional police officers, equipment, or facilities.

No significant demand for school services would result from the project, which is not expected to generate any increase in Palo Alto’s residential population. No significant direct demand for additional parks would result from the project, which is not expected to generate any increase in Palo Alto’s residential population.

### Mitigation Measures:

None

### RECREATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DISCUSSION:

The proposed project would not have any significant impact on existing parks, nor include or require construction of recreational facilities. No mitigation is required.

### O. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?</td>
<td>1, 6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>1, 6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>1, 6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., pedestrian, transit &amp; bicycle facilities)?</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Cause a local (City of Palo Alto) intersection to deteriorate below Level of Service (LOS) D and cause an increase in the average stopped delay for the critical movements by</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four seconds or more and the critical volume/capacity ratio (V/C) value to increase by 0.01 or more?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Cause a local intersection already operating at LOS E or F to deteriorate in the average stopped delay for the critical movements by four seconds or more?</td>
<td>1,2,6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Cause a regional intersection to deteriorate from an LOS E or better to LOS F or cause critical movement delay at such an intersection already operating at LOS F to increase by four seconds or more and the critical V/C value to increase by 0.01 or more?</td>
<td>1,2,6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) Cause a freeway segment to operate at LOS F or contribute traffic in excess of 1% of segment capacity to a freeway segment already operating at LOS F?</td>
<td>1,2,6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l) Cause any change in traffic that would increase the Traffic Infusion on Residential Environment (TIRE) index by 0.1 or more?</td>
<td>1,2,6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m) Cause queuing impacts based on a comparative analysis between the design queue length and the available queue storage capacity? Queuing impacts include, but are not limited to, spillback queues at project access locations; queues at turn lanes at intersections that block through traffic; queues at lane drops; queues at one intersection that extend back to impact other intersections, and spillback queues on ramps.</td>
<td>1,2,6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n) Impede the development or function of planned pedestrian or bicycle facilities?</td>
<td>1,2,6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o) Impede the operation of a transit system as a result of congestion?</td>
<td>1,2,6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p) Create an operational safety hazard?</td>
<td>1,6, 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

IV. Transportation/Traffic

Parking spaces are shown on the project plans dated 11/26/07. The plans include off-street parking spaces for customers and employees of the proposed garden supply business, as well as spaces reserved for the tenants of the adjoining property at 4007 Transport Road. The on-site and off-site circulation has been evaluated by City transportation staff. While a cueing system is not proposed, the large area provided for on-site circulation would allow for any necessary cueing on the site rather than on the public right of way.
An average of 84 daily vehicle trips were associated with the Ciardella's location on East Bayshore Road. Staff has provided estimated trip generation for the project in the chart below. Through empirical research, data have been collected that correlate to common land uses their propensity for producing traffic. Thus, for the most common land uses there are standard trip generation rates that can be applied to help predict future traffic increases that would result from a new development. The magnitude of the traffic generation by the proposed project was estimated by applying to the size of the development the applicable trip generation rates. These calculations, in the table below, are calculated on the basis of the trip generation rates published in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) manual entitled Trip Generation, seventh edition, 2003. The proposed project is a small commercial development on a currently vacant lot. It would appear that the anticipated nine morning peak hour vehicle trips can be accommodated via the 30 foot wide, two-way driveway. Customers are not anticipated to use bicycles due to the nature of the business. However, any customer or any employees using bicycles as transportation to the site will be able to safely store the bicycle on the site as would be required by conditions of ARB approval.

The single driveway is proposed to be located so as not to allow incoming traffic to the project site from the northbound lane of Transport Road, but to allow traffic to exit the project site onto southbound Transport Road. Traffic from San Antonio Avenue (spur road) can enter the site without impact upon Transport Road traffic, and can perform all turning maneuvers within the Ciardella's project site to exit onto Transport Road. A mitigation measure is provided to clarify the intent of the site's vehicular egress.

There would be no significant traffic impacts resulting from the project due to its small size. The City has not conducted an in-depth study of existing traffic and parking conditions on Transport Road and the one-way San Antonio Avenue spur road. Neighbors report conditions are problematic on Transport Road due to double parking of delivery vehicles on the street, and that there are instances of passenger vehicles not associated with Ciardella's driving the wrong way on the one-way spur road. The existing traffic situation on Transport Road and San Antonio Avenue spur road will be evaluated by City transportation and enforcement staff during the coming month(s) to encourage compliance with traffic laws and to explore remedies that may be appropriate to address the existing conditions, including the painting of curbs along Transport Road for limited time parking and/or loading. No mitigation measure is currently required of the applicant to address existing conditions. Conditions of ARB approval for Ciardella's may include installation of specific, directional signage and curb painting as necessary prior to the commencement of Ciardella's operations.

The Ciardella's morning deliveries are a practice of their business operation. The neighboring property owner requests that the city require the applicant to schedule deliveries for the morning to the extent practicable. A mitigation measure is provided below to address the concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traffic Generation</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate¹</td>
<td>Daily Rate²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Nursery (Garden Center)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Size expressed in acres
² Trip rates based on ITE Trip Generation 7th Edition, 2004, Nursery (Garden Center) (817)
Mitigation Measures:

Mitigation Measure #5: Vehicle traffic entering the project site’s driveway shall use the one-way San Antonio Avenue spur (bearing right at the split on San Antonio). Traffic exiting the project site shall travel onto Transport Road. Ciardella’s shall place signage as needed on other streets and/or directions to their location on their website that would indicate that trucks and other vehicles can only enter off of the spur road.

Mitigation Measure #6: Deliveries from suppliers shall, to the extent practicable, occur in the early morning hours when both traffic on Transport Road is at a minimum and the prevailing winds are not directed to the immediately adjacent neighbors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Result in a substantial physical deterioration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of a public facility due to increased use as a result of the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION:**

The proposed project would not significantly increase the demand on existing utilities and service systems, or use resources in a wasteful or inefficient manner. Standard approval conditions of Architectural Review will require the applicant to submit calculations by a registered civil engineer to show that the on-site and off site water, sewer and fire systems are capable of serving the needs of the garden supply business and adjacent properties during peak flow demands. Trash and recycling facilities will be required as a standard condition of ARB approval in conjunction with the establishment of the garden supply center to accommodate the expected waste and recycling streams that would be generated by the expected uses on the site.

**Mitigation Measures:**

None

---

**Q. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues and Supporting Information Resources</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>1,2-Map L4,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively'considerable&quot; 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)?</td>
<td>1,2,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>1,5,6,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION:

The project would not have an impact on fish or wildlife habitat, nor would it impact cultural or historic resources. The uses are appropriate for the site and the development would not result in an adverse visual impact. There is nothing in the nature of the proposed development and property improvements that would have a substantial adverse effect on human beings, or other life or environmental impacts.

SOURCE REFERENCES

1. Project Planner's knowledge of the site and the proposed project
2. Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan, 1998-2010
3. Palo Alto Municipal Code, Title 18 – Zoning Ordinance
4. Required compliance with the Uniform Building Code (UBC) Standards
5. California Department of Transportation Letter dated September 9, 2007
7. Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map
10. Agricultural Preserves Map, California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, 2001
11. Palo Alto Development Review Committee comments
**DETERMINATION**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

**Amy French**  
Planning Manager  
November 30, 2007  
Date

---

**Director of Planning and Community Environment**  
Date
Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration

A notice, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code 21,000, et seq.) that the following project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Number</th>
<th>TAZ</th>
<th>APN(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07PLN00276 and 07PLN00344</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>11/30/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Name**
Ciardella’s

**Project Type**
Rezone, land use designation, architectural review

**Owner**
State of California DOTransportation

**Applicant**
Larry Ciardella and Bob Bodelli

**Project Location**
Southwest corner of Caltrans property 1001 San Antonio Avenue, Palo Alto, north of Transport Road

**Project Description**
Request by Ciardella’s Garden Supply on behalf of Caltrans to establish Ciardella’s Garden Supply Center on 1.98 acres of land via City approval of the following applications: (1) A Rezoning of the site from Public Facilities District (PF) to General Manufacturing District (GM); (2) A Comprehensive Plan Amendment to apply a land use designation of Light Industrial (no designation currently exists); and (3) Architectural Review of site modifications.

**Purpose of Notice**
To elicit public and agency comments on the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration.

**Public Review Period:** 30 days
**Begins:** 11/30/07 (City), 12/3/07 (County)  **Ends:** 1/2/08

Public comments regarding the correctness, completeness, or adequacy of this negative declaration are invited and must be received on or before the end of the public review period. Such comments should be based on specific environmental concerns. Written comments should be addressed to the Current Planning Manager. Oral comments may be made at the hearing(s). A file containing additional information on this project may be reviewed at the Planning Office under the file numbers appearing at the top of this form. For additional information regarding this project and the Mitigated Negative Declaration, please contact Amy French, Current Planning Manager at (650) 329-2336

**The Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study may be viewed at the following locations:**
(1) City of Palo Alto, Development Center at 285 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto
(2) City of Palo Alto, 5th floor of City Hall at 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto
(3) Caltrans

**Responsible Agencies sent a copy of this document**
CalTrans
**Mitigation Measures included in the project to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less than significant level:**

**Mitigation Measure #1:** In order to reduce wind blown dust emissions, the applicant shall (a) cover and install wind breaks around and covers on dirt piles and other stockpiled particulate matter, (b) water and/or employ soil stabilizers, (c) incorporate the use of non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturer’s specifications to all inactive areas of the site, including all unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas. When water is used, a water spray system shall be installed, moisture content in soil and other particulate stockpiles shall be high enough to eliminate PM-10 “fugitive” emissions (wind-blown dust that could otherwise escape into the surrounding air) and concrete debris shall be kept damp on the surface.

**Mitigation Measure #2:** City standard conditions for minimization of dust during construction shall be in effect for duration of the operations of Ciardella’s on the subject site. Truck loads of dirt, sand or other loose material shall be covered as required, any transfer processes involving a free fall of soil or other particulate matter shall be operated in such a manner as to minimize the free fall distance and fugitive dust emissions, and active work areas (e.g. where soil handling is underway) shall be watered at least twice daily and more frequently as needed to prevent generation of dust. If soil material is carried out onto the public right of way, Ciardella’s will be required to address the problem.

**Mitigation Measure #3:** The applicant shall designate a person or persons responsible for Ciardella’s dust control measures, and clearly post on the exterior wall or fence of the facilities a company telephone number for citizens to call with dust, noise, or other operational complaints.

**Mitigation Measure #4:** The project will incorporate BMPs, including specific performance standards and if such standards are not met the City and Ciardella’s will reevaluate and impose additional mitigation as needed to and as may be appropriate to ensure that performance criteria are met.

**Mitigation Measure #5:** Vehicle traffic entering the project site’s driveway shall use the one-way San Antonio Avenue spur (bearing right at the split on San Antonio). Traffic exiting the project site shall travel onto Transport Road. Ciardella’s shall place signage as needed on other streets and/or directions to their location on their website that would indicate that trucks and other vehicles can only enter off of the spur road.

**Mitigation Measure #6:** Deliveries from suppliers shall, to the extent practicable, occur in the early morning hours when both traffic on Transport Road is at a minimum and the prevailing winds are not directed to the immediately adjacent neighbors.

A reporting or monitoring program must be adopted for measures to mitigate significant impacts at the time the Mitigated Negative Declaration is approved, in accord with the requirements of section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared by:</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>11/30/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved by:</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>12/3/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 3, 2008

Mr. Larry Ciardella
Mr. Bob Budelli
P.O. Box 50310
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Subject: 1001 San Antonio Avenue, ARB Approval, File 07PLN-00344

Dear Mr. Ciardella and Mr. Budelli:

On December 20, 2007, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) recommended approval of the application referenced above and as described further below, and the Director of Planning and Community Environment (Director) approved the ARB application on January 3, 2008, which was also the close of the public review period on the Mitigated Negative Declaration in accordance with the State Clearinghouse. Council review and action on the rezoning and land use designation is scheduled for February 11, 2008. The ARB approval will become effective 14 days from the postmark date of this letter, unless an appeal is filed in accordance with Title 18 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code.

The approval was based on the findings in Attachment A, and is subject to staff recommended conditions of approval. In accordance with California Government Code Section 66020, this is to provide you with notice of the amount of development fees and a description of the dedications, reservations, or other exactions imposed by the City of Palo Alto in connection with the project, described as follows:

1001 San Antonio Avenue [07PLN-00344]: Request by Bob Budelli and Larry Ciardella on behalf of the State of California for Minor Architectural Review of improvements to a 1.81 acre area of the Caltrans site that is accessible from Transport Road, to serve as the new location for Ciardella’s Garden Supply Center, subject to Council approval of a requested rezoning and land use designation to allow such use. Zone district: Public Facilities (PF) (proposed change to GM).

The fees, dedications, reservations or other exactions imposed by the City in connection with your development project are described in your conditions of approval and previously agreed upon mitigation measures attached to this letter, including by reference the approved development plans. Government Code Section 66020 provides that project applicant who desires to protest the fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions imposed on a development project must initiate the protest at the time the development project is approved or conditionally approved or within ninety (90) days after the date that fees, dedications, reservations or exactions are imposed on the project. Any protest regarding the amount of the development fees or the nature of the dedications, reservations or exactions imposed in
connection with your project must be initiated not later than ninety (90) calendar days following January 3, 2008. Additionally procedural requirements for protesting these development fees, dedications, reservations and exactions are set forth in Government Code Section 66020.

IF YOU FAIL TO INITIATE A PROTEST WITHIN THE 90-DAY PERIOD OR TO FOLLOW THE PROTEST PROCEDURES DESCRIBED IN GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 66020, YOU WILL BE BARRED FROM CHALLENGING THE VALIDITY OR REASONABLENESS OF THE FEES, DEDICATIONS, RESERVATIONS, AND EXACTIONS DESCRIBED ABOVE.

If you have any questions regarding the amount of the development fees or the nature of the dedications, reservations or exactions imposed in connection with your project, please call me at (650) 329-2336.

Unless an appeal is filed, this project approval shall be effective for one year from January 3, 2008, within which time construction of the project shall have commenced. Application for extension may be made prior to the expiration on January 3, 2009. The time period for a project may be extended once for an additional year by the Director of Planning and shall be open to appeal at that time. In the event the building permit is not secured for the project within the time limits specified above, the Architectural Review Board approval shall expire and be of no further force or effect.

Should you have any questions regarding this ARB action, please do not hesitate to call me at (650) 329-2336.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Amy French  
Manager of Current Planning

Attachments:
A: ARB Findings  
B: Conditions of Approval  
C: Fee estimate

Cc: Nicholas Jellins, esq. 
    Elizabeth Bridges, esq.  
    Jim Bozioneles
ATTACHMENT A
FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL
1001 San Antonio Avenue
07PLN-00000-00344

The design and architecture of the proposed improvements, as conditioned, complies with the Findings for Architectural Review as required in Chapter 18.76 of the PAMC.

(1) The design is consistent and compatible with applicable elements of the City’s Comprehensive Plan in that the site (currently lacking a land use designation) is to be designated Light Industrial and the Comprehensive Plan Table (Attachment C) indicates compliance with applicable policies;

(2) The design is compatible with the immediate environment of the site in that the percentage of building (1,440 square feet) on the site (78,943.6 square feet) will be 1% and the site’s perimeter will be screened with fences and boxed trees. Upon Council approval of the requested rezoning of the site to General Manufacturing (GM) to match the zoning of the adjacent district, the proposed garden supply center would become a permitted use in the GM district, where other manufacturing, warehousing and similar uses are common;

(3) The design is appropriate to the function of the project in that there is adequate parking and turnaround area on the site, and the modular office will be located to minimize views from off site.

(4) Finding not applicable.

(5) The design promotes harmonious transitions in scale and character from the adjacent Caltrans land to the more developed GM District business area.

(6) The design is compatible with approved improvements both on and off the site in that screening is provided to buffer views of the site from 4007 Transport Road, the one-way San Antonio Avenue (spur road) and the San Antonio Avenue approach to Highway 101.

(7) The planning and siting of the various functions and buildings on the site create an internal sense of order and provide a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community in that the proposed design will allow Ciardella’s to continue the garden supply center operations that are valued by the community;

(8) The amount and arrangement of open space are appropriate to the design and the function of the office and display trailer, in that the site is primarily open space with circulation around bins of garden supplies, and parking for staff more remotely from the trailer and customer parking closer to the trailer;
(9) Sufficient ancillary functions are provided to support the main functions of the project in that the proposal includes the implementation of mitigation measures and conditions of approval that will ensure smooth operations of the business;

(10) Access to the property and circulation thereon are safe and convenient for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles in that, with signage installed as conditioned, motorists will enter and exit the site via San Antonio Avenue.;

(11) Natural features are appropriately preserved and integrated with the project in that the existing trees are to be retained and protected.;

(12) The materials, textures, colors and details of construction and plant material are appropriate expressions of the design and function in that all installations must necessarily be temporary due to the nature of the applicant’s lease with Caltrans;

(13) The landscape design concept for the site, as shown by the relationship of plant masses, open space, scale, plant forms and foliage textures and colors create a desirable and functional environment in that the fences and boxed trees will provide some screening of the site;

(14) Plant material is suitable and adaptable to the site, capable of being properly maintained on the site, and is of a variety which would tend to be drought-resistant and to reduce consumption of water in its installation and maintenance;

(15) The project exhibits green building and sustainable design that is energy efficient, water conserving, durable and nontoxic, with high-quality spaces and high recycled content materials. This new finding is applicable with respect to water conservation and drainage. Due to the temporary nature of the lease, more permanent and possibly greener solutions are not possible. If Caltrans were to grant a long term lease to the applicant, additional green building and sustainable site design may be considered.

(16) The design is consistent and compatible with the purpose of architectural review, which is to:

   (1) Promote orderly and harmonious development in the city;
   (2) Enhance the desirability of residence or investment in the city;
   (3) Encourage the attainment of the most desirable use of land and improvements;
   (4) Enhance the desirability of living conditions upon the immediate site or in adjacent areas; and
   (5) Promote visual environments which are of high aesthetic quality and variety and which, at the same time, are considerate of each other.

The design is consistent for all of the reasons and findings enumerated above.
ATTACHMENT B
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
1001 San Antonio Avenue, File No. 07PLN-00344

Planning & Community Environment Department

Planning Division

1. The plans submitted to obtain all permits through the Building Inspections Division shall be in substantial conformance with the plans and the project details/materials received on November 30 and December 13, 2007, except as modified to incorporate these conditions of approval. The driveway location shown on the December 13, 2007 site plan shall be reflected in the other plan sheets submitted for Building Permit(s).

2. All conditions of approval shall be printed on the cover sheet of the plan set submitted to obtain any permit through the Building Inspections Division.

3. The Mitigation Measures from the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be incorporated into the project:

   Mitigation Measure #1: In order to reduce wind blown dust emissions, the applicant shall (a) cover and install wind breaks around and covers on dirt piles and other stockpiled particulate matter, (b) water and/or employ soil stabilizers, (c) incorporate the use of non-toxic soil stabilizers according to manufacturer’s specifications to all inactive areas of the site, including all unpaved roads and employee/equipment parking areas. When water is used, a water spray system shall be installed, moisture content in soil and other particulate stockpiles shall be high enough to eliminate PM-10 “fugitive” emissions (wind-blown dust that could otherwise escape into the surrounding air) and concrete debris shall be kept damp on the surface.

   Mitigation Measure #2: City standard conditions for minimization of dust during construction shall be in effect for duration of the operations of Ciardella’s on the subject site. Truck loads of dirt, sand or other loose material shall be covered as required, any transfer processes involving a free fall of soil or other particulate matter shall be operated in such a manner as to minimize the free fall distance and fugitive dust emissions, and active work areas (e.g. where soil handling is underway) shall be watered at least twice daily and more frequently as needed to prevent generation of dust. If soil material is carried out onto the public right of way, Ciardella’s will be required to address the problem.

   Mitigation Measure #3: The applicant shall designate a person or persons responsible for Ciardella’s dust control measures, and clearly post on the exterior wall or fence of the facilities a company telephone number for citizens to call with dust, noise, or other operational complaints.
Mitigation Measure #4: The project will incorporate BMPs, including specific performance standards and if such standards are not met the City and Ciardella's will reevaluate and impose additional mitigation as needed to and as may be appropriate to ensure that performance criteria are met.

Mitigation Measure #5: Vehicle traffic entering the project site’s driveway shall use the one-way San Antonio Avenue spur (bearing right at the split on San Antonio). Traffic exiting the project site shall travel onto Transport Road. Ciardella's shall place signage as needed on other streets and/or directions to their location on their website that would indicate that trucks and other vehicles can only enter off of the spur road.

Mitigation Measure #6: Deliveries from suppliers shall, to the extent practicable, occur in the early morning hours when both traffic on Transport Road is at a minimum and the prevailing winds are not directed to the immediately adjacent neighbors.

4. Lighting fixtures shall be downward directional to prevent significant light pollution offsite.

5. Sprinklers shall be installed at the end of the storage bins to provide regular watering of materials.

6. The construction and operations of Ciardella’s Garden Supply Center on the site shall meet the regulations of City’s noise ordinance (Chapter 9.10 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code).

7. A separate ARB application shall be submitted for signage advertising the business. Directional signage and business information (including the website for the business) shall be strategically placed as necessary so that clients and suppliers will understand that all access to the site is from San Antonio Avenue and that exiting traffic must proceed from San Antonio Avenue onto Transport Road (and not against one way traffic on San Antonio Avenue).

Transportation Division

8. The drive way shall use standard commercial returns per CPA Standard 123.

9. All parking for the business shall be provided on the site to meet the demand. No on-street parking for the business will be allowed.

10. Bicycle parking shall be provided on the site per PAMC Chapter 18.52.

11. The applicant shall install a “no right turn” sign (R-16) at the west end of the driveway return.
Building Division

PRIOR TO PERMIT APPLICATION:

12. A building permit shall be required for the installation of the proposed modular office building.

13. The modular building shall be certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and shall have a placard affixed at the rear exterior wall describing its use as a “B” occupancy group.

14. The plans submitted with the building permit application shall include a foundation plan and structural calculations for the vertical and lateral support of the modular building prepared by a CA licensed civil or structural engineer. Foundation plan shall include a layout of the piers and holdowns including details and specifications for the proposed HCD listed piers and holdowns devices.

15. The building permit drawings shall indicate location and contain specifications and installation details of the proposed electrical generator.

16. The building permit drawings shall indicate method of discharge of the effluent from required toilet facilities in the building or onsite or show connection to the domestic sewer system.

17. The primary entrance to the building shall be accessible by a ramp.

Planning Arborist/Landscape Specialist

PRIOR TO PERMIT APPLICATION:

The approved plans submitted for building permit shall include the bulleted items:

18. In order to protect the existing tree near the "container dry goods area" please incorporate the following into your landscape site plan:
   - Apply a 4-inch layer of wood chips within 10 feet of the existing tree trunk.
   - Place three boulders 8' from the existing tree - show on site plan and provide a detail for building permit plan set.

19. Add the following note on irrigation on sheet LA-1:
   Irrigation shall be bubbler head mounted on flexible tubing placed on top of the root ball, two per tree. Do not place irrigation within aeration tubes.

20. Add sheet T-1 “Tree Protection-it’s Part of the Plan” to the building set. (See http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/environment/forms.html), complete the Tree Disclosure Statement and check Inspection(s) #1-5.

PRIOR TO FINAL
21. Quality control measures shall include Landscape Architect approval of all trees to conform to “Guideline Specifications for Nursery Tree Quality” (http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/environment/forms.html), rejection of substandard trees, and final inspection of boxed tree placement, irrigation system function and related tree condition.

22. Applicant shall arrange for a final inspection of project conditions by Planning Department staff. Applicant shall provide written verification that the Landscape Architect has inspected all trees, shrubs, planting and irrigation and that they are installed and functioning as specified in the approved plans.

**POST CONSTRUCTION**

23. Maintenance. All landscape and site elements shall be continuously maintained consistent with this approval. Trees and vegetation shall be watered, fertilized, and pruned according to and Best Management Practices-Pruning (ANSI A300-2001). Any vegetation that dies shall be replaced or failed automatic irrigation repaired by the current property owner within 30 days of discovery.

**Fire Department**

24. Site address to be prominently posted next to the driveway access to the property. (2001CFC901)

25. Diesel generator shall be provided with secondary containment to prevent any fuel leaks from contaminating soil and groundwater. (PAMC15.04.282)

26. Inspection required by Hazardous Materials staff to verify compliance.

**Public Works Department**

**Engineering Division**

27. STREET TREES: The applicant may be required to replace existing and/or add new street trees in the public right-of-way along the property’s frontage per the direction of Public Works’ arborist. Call the arborist at 650-496-5953 to arrange a site visit so the staff can determine what street tree work, if any, will be required for this project. The site plan submitted with the building permit plan set must show the street tree work that the arborist has determined, including the tree species, size, location, staking and irrigation requirements, or include a note that Public Works’ arborist has determined no street tree work is required. The plan must note that in order to do street tree work, the applicant must first obtain a Permit for Street Tree Work in the Public Right-of-Way from Public Works’ arborist.

The following comments are provided to assist the applicant at the building permit phase. You can obtain various plan set details or forms from Public Works at the City's
Development Center (285 Hamilton Avenue) or on Public Works’ website:
www.cityofpaloalto.org/depts/pwd/forms_permits.asp.

Include in plans submitted for a building permit:

28. FLOOD ZONE: The site is located within a Special Flood Hazard Area. Accordingly, any new structures, including a “manufactured home”, must meet all of the City’s and Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) requirements for construction within a flood zone. This is the definition in the City’s Flood Hazard Regulations: “Manufactured home” means a structure, transportable in one or more sections, which is built on a permanent chassis and is designed for use with or without a permanent foundation when it is attached to the required utilities.” Therefore, we consider the office trailer to be a “manufactured home” and, as such, it must comply with the regulations, including: the finished bottom floor must be above the base flood elevation (BFE); the crawl space (if used) must have flood vents; all construction materials and equipment below the BFE must be water-resistant; and the structure must be anchored. The generator alongside the trailer must be elevated above the BFE. See Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 16.52, Flood Hazard Regulations, and our website for more information. The plans must show the BFE on all applicable elevations, sections and details; must include a calculation of the required amount of flood vents; must include the flood vents on the elevations and foundation plan; must note all materials below the BFE as water-resistant; and must include the Elevation Certification Submittal Requirements for Construction in the Special Flood Hazard Area form, which is available from Public Works at the Development Center or on our website.

29. GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN: The plan set must include a grading & drainage plan prepared by a licensed professional that includes existing and proposed spot elevations and drainage flow arrows to demonstrate proper drainage of the site. Adjacent grades must slope away from the building a minimum of 2%. Downspouts and splash-blocks should be shown on this plan, as well as any site drainage features such as swales. Grading will not be allowed that increases drainage onto, nor blocks existing drainage from, neighboring properties. The conceptual grading and drainage plan submitted shows a detention basin being constructed on adjacent property to serve the subject property. The applicant must provide evidence that they have permission from the adjacent property owner to do this work.

30. SWPPP: The proposed development will disturb more than one acre of land. Accordingly, the applicant must apply for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB) NPDES general permit for storm water discharge associated with construction activity. A Notice of Intent (NOI) must be filed for this project with the SWRCB in order to obtain coverage under the permit. The General Permit requires the applicant to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The applicant is required to submit two copies of the NOI and the draft SWPPP to the Public Works
Department for review and approval prior to issuance of the building permit. The SWPPP should include both permanent, post-development project design features and temporary measures employed during construction to control storm water pollution.

31. **STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION**: The City's full-sized "Pollution Prevention - It's Part of the Plan" sheet must be included in the plan set. Copies are available from Public Works at the Development Center or on our website.

32. **STREET TREES**: Show all street trees in the public right-of-way and City-owned trees on adjacent property or note that there are none. Any removal, relocation or planting of these trees; or excavation, trenching or pavement within 10 feet of these trees must be approved by Public Works' arborist (phone: 650-496-5953). This approval shall appear on the plans.

33. **WORK IN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY**: The plans must clearly indicate any work that is proposed in the public right-of-way, such as sidewalk replacement, driveway approach, or utility laterals. The plans must include notes that the work must be done per City standards and that the contractor(s) performing this work must first obtain a * Permit for Construction in the Public Street* from Public Works at the Development Center.

34. **IMPEVIOUS SURFACE AREA**: The project will be creating or replacing 500 square feet or more of impervious surface. Accordingly, the applicant shall provide calculations of the existing and proposed impervious surface areas with the building permit application. The *Impervious Area Worksheet for Land Developments* form and instructions are available at the Development Center or on our website.

35. **C.3**: This project appears to trigger the California Regional Water Quality Control Board's revised provision C.3 for storm water regulations (incorporated into the Palo Alto Municipal Code, Section 16.11) that apply to land development projects that create or replace 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface. The applicant shall provide a calculation of the amount of impervious surface area being created or replaced. I note that the site plan shows compacted base rock as the finished site surface for much of the site. Public Works considers compacted base rock to be impervious. If 10,000 square feet of impervious surface area is created or replaced, then the City's regulations require that the project incorporate a set of permanent site design measures, source controls, and treatment controls that serve to protect storm water quality. The applicant will be required to identify, size, design and incorporate permanent storm water pollution prevention measures (preferably landscape-based treatment controls such as bio-swales, filter strips, and permeable pavers rather than mechanical devices that require long-term maintenance) to treat the runoff from a specified “water quality storm” prior to discharge to the municipal storm drain system. The applicant must designate a party to maintain the control measures for the life of the improvements and must enter into a maintenance agreement with the City. The City will inspect the
treatment measures yearly and charge an inspection fee. There is currently a $750 C.3 plan check fee that will be collected upon submittal for a grading or building permit.

36. The plans show swales to convey the water across the site and into the detention basin. Detail B/C2 shows a bio-swale that may serve to treat the storm water, but the other swales are not detailed and it appears that most of them are over the surface of the compacted base-rock, which means they are probably not treating the storm water. A detailed review of the C.3 calculations and plans will occur at the grading and/or building permit phase, but it appears that the storm water is not being treated onsite before it is released offsite.

Utilities Department

Water, Gas, Wastewater Division

37. The applicant shall submit a completed water-gas-wastewater service connection application - load sheet for City of Palo Alto Utilities. The applicant must provide all the information requested for utility service demands (water in fixture units/g.p.m., gas in b.u.p.h, and sewer in fixture units/g.p.d.).

38. The applicant shall submit improvement plans for utility construction. The plans must show the size and location of all underground utilities within the development and the public right of way including meters, backflow preventers, fire service requirements, sewer mains, sewer cleanouts, sewer lift stations and any other required utilities.

39. The applicant must show on the site plan the existence of any water well, or auxiliary water supply.

40. The applicant shall be responsible for installing and upgrading the existing utility services and/or mains as necessary to handle anticipated peak loads. This responsibility includes all costs associated with the design and construction for the installation/upgrade of the utility services and/or mains.

41. The applicant shall pay the capacity fees and connection fees associated with the installation of the new utility service/s to be installed by the City of Palo Alto Utilities. The approved relocation of services, meters, hydrants, or other facilities will be performed at the cost of the person/entity requesting the relocation.

42. An approved reduce pressure principle assembly (RPPA backflow preventer device) shall be installed for all existing and new water connections from Palo Alto Utilities to comply with requirements of California administrative code, title 17, sections 7583 through 7605 inclusive. The RPPA shall be installed on the owner's property and directly behind the water meter. Show the location of the RPPA on the plans. Inspection by the utilities cross connection inspector is required for the supply pipe between the meter and the assembly.
43. All utility installations shall be in accordance with the City of Palo Alto utility standards for water, gas & wastewater.

44. The applicant shall obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans for all utility work in the Caltrans right-of-way. The applicant must provide a copy of the permit to the WGW engineering section.

/Public Works Recycling Division/

45. The applicant shall meet the provision s of Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) Chapter 5.20 regarding the storage of garbage and recycling.
TO: ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

FROM: Amy French, Manager of Current Planning

DEPARTMENT: Planning and Community Environment

AGENDA DATE: December 20, 2007

SUBJECT: 1001 San Antonio Avenue [07PLN-00344]: Request by Bob Budelli and Larry Ciardella on behalf of the State of California for Minor Architectural Review of improvements to a 1.81 acre area of the Caltrans site that is accessible from Transport Road, to serve as the new location for Ciardella’s Garden Supply Center, subject to Council approval of a requested rezoning and land use designation to allow such use. Environmental Assessment: A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and the public review has period commenced. Zone district: Public Facilities (PF) (proposed change to GM).

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) recommend the Director of Planning and Community Environment approve the proposed project based upon the Architectural Review Findings (Attachment A), and Mitigated Negative Declaration findings and subject to the conditions of approval (Attachment B) attached to this report.

BACKGROUND:
The site is the area located at the north terminus of Transport Road, in the existing Caltrans right-of-way, known as 1001 San Antonio Avenue. Caltrans has used the site as a storage and construction mobilization yard. Caltrans had recently been leasing the San Antonio site to a contractor working on state highway projects. CalTrans has now leased the subject land (1.81 acres) on a yearly basis to Ciardella’s, a local garden supply center, in anticipation of City approvals of entitlements. Previously, Ciardella’s was located at 2027 East Bayshore Road, land owned by the Santa Clara Valley Water District and leased to Ciardella’s. The City’s pump station project implementation required Ciardella’s to move from their previous location by September 2007.

Ciardella’s requested a rezoning of a 1.81 acre site at 1001 San Antonio Avenue from the
PF to the GM zone district and a land use designation of Light Industrial. In order to assist the business and avoid downtime, staff scheduled public hearings in advance of receiving the rezoning application and Caltrans correspondence, which was received September 9, 2007. The request was initiated at a public hearing on April 11, 2007 and later recommended to the Council by the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) at the PTC meeting on September 19, 2007 (on a 6-0 vote).

Caltrans had authorized grading and placement of base rock on the site and this site work was done with the approval and oversight of CalTrans. Ciardella’s began to move items to the site several weeks prior to the PTC hearing, and the neighbors’ concerns, primarily regarding dust, drainage and traffic, were heard by the PTC, and the original Mitigated Negative Declaration was revised at the hearing. Subsequent to the PTC hearing, code enforcement staff visited the site and ascertained that the business had begun operating on the site and a letter was issued on October 4, 2007 to demand cessation of all commercial activities.

On October 22, 2007, the City Council reviewed the request and continued their review to a date uncertain, so that the applicant could submit additional information to staff and the environmental document could be further revised to better address proposed physical improvements on the site. Staff encouraged the applicant to submit for ARB review to enable City staff to review these improvements for compliance with city regulations and allow the opportunity for public input on the proposed site improvements prior to the Council’s further review of the rezoning. The project plans have been reviewed by City staff at two of the City’s Development Review Committee meeting.

The adjacent property owner at 4007-4009 Transport Road has been involved in reviewing the project from an environmental review standpoint, and has received and reviewed the plans, environmental document and draft conditions of approval. This property owner has been focused on ensuring adequate conditions for her tenants, a paper company. She has been exploring with Caltrans the leasing of a portion of the subject property, in order to provide employee parking for the tenants in her building.

Staff met with the applicant and the adjacent property owner and their legal representation on November 19th. The applicant has been cooperative in revising plans in the interim to address staff’s concerns regarding vehicular access, parking, perimeter plantings, modular office, bin placement, office floor height, ramp access, and drainage.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

Approval of the site modifications, in conjunction with the rezoning, would allow the establishment of Ciardella’s, considered a “general business service,” on the site. Site grading and application of base rock were previously installed under Caltrans’ oversight. Revised grading plans have been reviewed by the City’s Public Works staff and implementation of conditions of approval will ensure the City’s standards will be met.
Site Screening
Since all work on the site is to be temporary, in accordance with Caltrans requirements, the applicants are not authorized to provide a solid wall or fence or plant permanent trees to screen the property from offsite views. Existing trees outside the perimeter edges of the site along the westerly, northerly and northeasterly edge of the site will contribute to the screening efforts. There is a distance of approximately 30 feet between the northerly property line of 4007 Transport and the closest parking facilities for Ciardella’s. The proposal includes the placement, along the long edge of the trailer facing the paper company at 4007 Transport Road, of a double-screened, 10 foot tall fence and evergreen trees that will remain in boxes.

The remainder of the site’s perimeter is to receive six foot tall screening fences and evergreen trees. The plans indicate the placement of 29 boxed trees in total. Existing trees on the site are to be preserved, and special conditions of approval require protection measures for the Elm tree near the containers for dry goods.

Storage bins and containers
The proposed improvements include the placement and or relocation of bulk storage bins (approximately 36 bins formed of concrete “lego blocks”), dry goods containers (approximately 3 containers), and areas for pavers and stone pallets. The plans indicate the storage of pallets for pavers and stone in the area where formerly compost bins had been located near 4007 Transport Road. It is believed the proximity of the compost to 4007 Transport Road had created dust issues for the paper business at that location.

Office, Generator and Lighting
The modular office trailer would provide areas for product display and office. The 10’6” tall office trailer is to have its floor at 2’9” above grade, for an overall height of 13’3” above grade and will meet the base flood elevation. An accessible ramp is proposed on the northeast elevation. It is shown in plans as adjusted from its current location on the site to align its short side with the front wall of the building on the adjacent site at 4007-4009 Transport Road. This new placement, along with the two boxed trees at the end of Transport Road, will help mitigate views down Transport of the site. The body color is beige, with dark green doors and sage green window and door trim. A sample of paint colors will be displayed at the ARB meeting.

A generator is proposed to be located adjacent to the easterly end of the office trailer, and will be screened from offsite views. A wall sconce is shown above each of the two doors, which are located on the front and rear elevations of the trailer. The proposed illumination is 100 watt fluorescent flood light, for security purposes. A condition of approval requires the lighting fixtures to be downward directional to prevent significant light pollution offsite.

Driveway and Parking
The driveway, at a width of 30 feet, has been recently redesigned to allow both ingress and egress to the one-way San Antonio Avenue. Exiting traffic would then proceed down Transport Road. The most recent revision to the driveway location (see sheet SP-1) was
submitted on December 13, 2007 to respond to transportation staff’s concern about traffic enforcement related to the November 26, 2007 plans. The other site plan sheets have not yet been corrected to match the driveway location reflected on sheet SP-1.

Adequate vehicle turnaround is to be provided on the site. Areas for employee parking (10 spaces) and customer parking (10 spaces including one handicapped space) are provided at the northerly corner of the site and near the office trailer. Conditions of approval will ensure that all sheets of the plan set submitted for Building Permits reflect the new driveway location and provide adequate turnaround area.

The plans indicate an area of approximately 3,500 square feet (.08 acre) that will accommodate approximately 15 parking spaces for tenants of the adjacent property at 4007 Transport Road. The use of the parking spaces would be subject to the property owner of 4007 Transport Road securing a lease from Caltrans and permits from the City of Palo Alto.

**SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES:**

**Size of Rezone Area vs. Ciardella’s Lease Area**
The applicant’s project description letter (Attachment D), and therefore the November 30, 2007 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Attachment E), reflect an area of 1.98 acres for the rezoning and proposed improvements. Plan Sheet C-2 indicates the area to be leased from Caltrans is 1.81 acres. The .08 acre area “reserved” for the adjoining property owner’s parking proposal, is included within the 1.81 acres to be used by Ciardella’s.

**Conformance to Adopted Plans and Policies and ARB Decision**
This ARB application can only be approved by the Director of Planning and Community Environment in conjunction with the City Council’s favorable decision on the request for rezoning and land use designation. The date for Council review is now set for February 11, 2008. It is anticipated that the Director would review comments on the Initial Study/Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration submitted during the public review period, receive the ARB’s recommendation on the site improvements, and render a conditional decision on the ARB application, subject to completion of action on the rezoning and land use designation by the City Council. The ARB appeal period of 14 days would allow any aggrieved person to request a hearing before the City Council regarding the ARB decision.

Tables setting forth how the proposed rezoning and location of Ciardella’s Garden Supply to the site is consistent with the policies of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, proposed Light Industrial land use designation and GM Zoning District regulations are attached (Attachment C). Findings for ARB Approval are set forth in Attachment A. Conditions of Approval are set forth in Attachment B.
Parking, Transportation and Traffic Items
As noted, parking spaces are to be provided on the site for customers and employees of the proposed garden supply business, as well as the spaces set aside in “landscape reserve” for the tenants of the adjoining property at 4007 Transport Road at such time as a lease and permits are obtained.

The on-site and off-site circulation has been evaluated by City transportation staff. While a queuing system is not proposed, the large area provided for on-site circulation would allow for any necessary queuing on the site rather than on the public right of way. The most recent plan (sheet SP-1) indicates ingress and egress to the one-way San Antonio Avenue. Traffic from San Antonio Avenue (spur road) can enter the site without impact upon Transport Road traffic, and can perform all turning maneuvers within the Ciardella’s project site. The single driveway would allow traffic to exit the project site onto San Antonio Avenue and proceed southbound on Transport Road. However, according to the applicant, some of the larger trucks may need greater clearance than San Antonio Avenue, given the existing street parking spaces on the opposite side of the Avenue. City transportation staff will work with the applicant to determine how far west the existing red curb paint at the corner of San Antonio Avenue and Transport Road would need to be extended to allow for safe, large truck maneuvers onto and from San Antonio Avenue. Staff would initiate the extension of red curb painting as determined to be necessary prior to the commencement of operations using the new driveway location.

Neighbors report conditions are problematic on Transport Road due to double parking of delivery vehicles on the street, and that there are instances of passenger vehicles not associated with Ciardella’s driving the wrong way on the one-way spur road. As noted in the initial study, the existing traffic situation on Transport Road and San Antonio Avenue spur road will be evaluated by City transportation and enforcement staff during the coming months to encourage compliance with traffic laws and to explore remedies that may be appropriate to address the existing conditions, including the painting of curbs along Transport Road for limited time parking and/or loading. Staff will initiate a yellow curb painting request to create a loading only portion of the frontage of 4007 Transport, at such time as the employee spaces are in place on the Caltrans site and use is authorized for the 4007 Transport Road tenants.

The conditions of ARB approval include the installation of specific, directional signage and curb painting as necessary prior to the commencement of Ciardella’s operations, and provision of bicycle parking on the site.

The Traffic Generation table that was provided in the most recent Initial Study addressed a one acre site, noting 96 daily trips, 9 AM peak hour trips and 10 PM peak hour trips. The Initial Study project description noted a 1.98 acre site, based upon the applicant’s project description letter, as noted. The applicant’s plans indicate the Ciardella’s lease is 1.81 acres in size, but this includes the parking reserve area for 4007 Transport Road. The resulting 1.73 acre lease area for the garden supply center would result in an estimated total of 166 daily trips, 16 peak AM trips and 17 peak AM trips. The Initial
Study will be amended to reflect the 1.81 acre area of the Ciardella’s lease with respect to rezoning, and 1.73 acre area with respect to estimated trips. Due to the adjusted driveway location, mitigation measures and ARB conditions of approval, the impact to traffic is still considered to be less than significant.

**Site Drainage**
The project plans include civil drawings providing for erosion control, appropriate re-grading and the addition of drainage swales to ensure water will not sheet off the site onto the property at 4007 Transport Road and to ensure water will be directed to storm drainage on the southerly edge of the site and the drainage basin off site at the northwesterly edge of the Caltrans site. Though recent site improvements were analyzed and authorized by Caltrans, who reviewed erosion control plans and measures to ensure that during demolition, grading and construction, no storm water pollution could result, the City Public Works Engineering staff have reviewed the plans for consistency with the City’s requirements and have provided standard conditions of architectural review approval to require the incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) for storm water pollution prevention and submittal of a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) in conjunction with building permit plans to address potential water quality impacts.

**Signage**
No plans for signage were included in the ARB plan set. A separate application may be submitted for staff level architectural review of signage advertising the business. However, as noted above, the ARB conditions of approval for this application require installation of specific, directional signage prior to the commencement of Ciardella’s operations.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**
The proposed project is subject to environmental review under provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Attachment E) was prepared and released on November 30, 2007, along with a Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The areas identified for mitigation were aesthetics, air quality, hydrology/water quality, and transportation/traffic.

The public review period began November 30, 2007 locally, and the document was routed to the State Clearing House due to potential issues of statewide significance (Caltrans land), so the end of the public review period is January 3, 2008. Staff proposes that the project would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, with the implementation of mitigation measures. Comments on the document and/or measures that result in clarification of the document and measures would not necessitate a recirculation of the document. The mitigation measures have been noted as incorporated into the ARB draft Conditions of Approval.
ATTACHMENTS:
A. Findings for Architectural Review
B. Recommended Conditions of Approval
C. Comprehensive Plan Policies and Zoning Compliance Tables
D. Applicant’s Project Description Letter dated November 1, 2007
E. Notice of Intent and Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
F. Email correspondence supporting Ciardella’s
G. Site Plan submitted 12/13/07
H. Project Plans (Board members only and in City files)

COURTESY COPIES:

Prepared by: Amy French, AICP, Manager of Current Planning

Manager Review: Curtis Williams, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning
ATTACHMENT A
DRAFT FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL
1001 San Antonio Avenue
07PLN-00000-00344

The design and architecture of the proposed improvements, as conditioned, complies with the Findings for Architectural Review as required in Chapter 18.76 of the PAMC.

(1) The design is consistent and compatible with applicable elements of the City's Comprehensive Plan in that the site (currently lacking a land use designation) is to be designated Light Industrial and the Comprehensive Plan Table (Attachment C) indicates compliance with applicable policies;

(2) The design is compatible with the immediate environment of the site in that the percentage of building (1,440 square feet) on the site (78,943.6 square feet) will be 1% and the site's perimeter will be screened with fences and boxed trees. Upon Council approval of the requested rezoning of the site to General Manufacturing (GM) to match the zoning of the adjacent district, the proposed garden supply center would become a permitted use in the GM district, where other manufacturing, warehousing and similar uses are common;

(3) The design is appropriate to the function of the project in that there is adequate parking and turnaround area on the site, and the modular office will be located to minimize views from off site.

(4) Finding not applicable.

(5) The design promotes harmonious transitions in scale and character from the adjacent Caltrans land to the more developed GM District business area.

(6) The design is compatible with approved improvements both on and off the site in that screening is provided to buffer views of the site from 4007 Transport Road, the one-way San Antonio Avenue (spur road) and the San Antonio Avenue approach to Highway 101.

(7) The planning and siting of the various functions and buildings on the site create an internal sense of order and provide a desirable environment for occupants, visitors and the general community in that the proposed design will allow Ciardella’s to continue the garden supply center operations that are valued by the community;

(8) The amount and arrangement of open space are appropriate to the design and the function of the office and display trailer, in that the site is primarily open space with circulation around bins of garden supplies, and parking for staff more remotely from the trailer and customer parking closer to the trailer;
(9) Sufficient ancillary functions are provided to support the main functions of the project in that the proposal includes the implementation of mitigation measures and conditions of approval that will ensure smooth operations of the business;

(10) Access to the property and circulation thereon are safe and convenient for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles in that, with signage installed as conditioned, motorists will enter and exit the site via San Antonio Avenue.;

(11) Natural features are appropriately preserved and integrated with the project in that the existing trees are to be retained and protected.;

(12) The materials, textures, colors and details of construction and plant material are appropriate expressions of the design and function in that all installations must necessarily be temporary due to the nature of the applicant’s lease with Caltrans;

(13) The landscape design concept for the site, as shown by the relationship of plant masses, open space, scale, plant forms and foliage textures and colors create a desirable and functional environment in that the fences and boxed trees will provide some screening of the site;

(14) Plant material is suitable and adaptable to the site, capable of being properly maintained on the site, and is of a variety which would tend to be drought-resistant and to reduce consumption of water in its installation and maintenance;

(15) The project exhibits green building and sustainable design that is energy efficient, water conserving, durable and nontoxic, with high-quality spaces and high recycled content materials. This new finding is applicable with respect to water conservation and drainage. Due to the temporary nature of the lease, more permanent and possibly greener solutions are not possible. If Caltrans were to grant a long term lease to the applicant, additional green building and sustainable site design may be considered.

(16) The design is consistent and compatible with the purpose of architectural review, which is to:

  (1) Promote orderly and harmonious development in the city;
  (2) Enhance the desirability of residence or investment in the city;
  (3) Encourage the attainment of the most desirable use of land and improvements;
  (4) Enhance the desirability of living conditions upon the immediate site or in adjacent areas; and
  (5) Promote visual environments which are of high aesthetic quality and variety and which, at the same time, are considerate of each other.

The design is consistent for all of the reasons and findings enumerated above.
## ATTACHMENT C
### COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND ZONING COMPLIANCE
1001 San Antonio Avenue / File No. 07PLN-00344

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPREHENSIVE PLAN POLICY</th>
<th>CONSISTENCY REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy B-4</strong>: Nurture and support established businesses as well as new businesses.</td>
<td>Ciardella's is an established business and the City has supported their relocation to this site after the loss of their former site due to the implementation of the approved pump station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy B-5</strong>: Maintain distinct business districts within Palo Alto as a means of retaining local services and diversifying the City's economic base.</td>
<td>The San Antonio Road/Bayshore Corridor employment district will be strengthened by the addition of this new site for a business and retaining this local service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy B-33</strong>: Discourage actions that could increase the cost of business space in the San Antonio Road and East Bayshore areas.</td>
<td>The siting of this business on Caltrans land will not increase the cost of business space in the San Antonio Road/Bayshore Corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy L-46</strong>: Maintain the East Bayshore and San Antonio Road/Bayshore Corridor areas as diverse business and light industrial districts.</td>
<td>The proposal for a garden supply center will add to the diversity of this employment district and will be a permitted use upon Council approval of the requested site rezoning to the GM district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy L-75</strong>: Minimize the negative physical impacts of parking lots. Locate parking behind buildings or underground wherever possible.</td>
<td>The Ciardella's parking spaces are divided into three areas, separated by bulk bin storage, trailer and boxed trees. 13 of the spaces will be located behind the trailer as viewed from Transport Road. Three of the parking spaces will be located behind a storage bin wall, and the remainder will be located farthest from San Antonio Avenue(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy L-76</strong>: Require trees and other landscaping within parking lots.</td>
<td>The boxed trees near the trailer would shade some customer and employee parking spaces. The employee parking adjacent to the bins will be shaded by existing/proposed trees. The customer spaces near the trailer will be shaded by the trailer for part of the day, but exposed to westerly sun. The parking designed for use by tenants of 4007 Transport Road will be shaded by that building and by the trailer and trees for much of the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy L-28</strong>: Encourage development that creatively integrates parking into the project by providing for shared use of parking areas.</td>
<td>The project shows parking spaces on the 1.81 acre lease area designed for use by the adjacent tenants of 4007 Transport Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy T-19</strong>: Improve and add attractive, secure bicycle parking at both public and private facilities.</td>
<td>Per conditions of approval, bicycle parking spaces will be provided on the site for use by employees and customers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy L-22: Limit the amount of impervious surface in new development ... to reduce urban runoff into storm drains, creeks and San Francisco Bay.

The site received base rock under Caltrans’ guidance prior to submittal of this application. The site will be modified with swales to guide stormwater to Transport Road and to the proposed retention area also on Caltrans’ land.

Project’s Conformance with Zoning Code Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Regulation</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Conformance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>20’ fronting Bayshore Highway (101)</td>
<td>95’ to trailer</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>&gt;30’ to trailer</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Setback</td>
<td>0’</td>
<td>&gt;250’ to trailer</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>Maximum FAR 0.5:1</td>
<td>.01:1</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>No requirement</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>13’-3”</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 30, 2007

City of Palo Alto
Planning and Community Environment Department
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Re: Ciardella Garden Supply, 1001 San Antonio Ave

Planning Department:

After the Ciardella Garden Supply lease was terminated to make way for a flood control pump station at 2728 East Bayshore Road in Palo Alto, this site owned by Cal Trans was identified as the new home for the almost 50 year old business.

In well-documented point of fact, this business is the epitome of environmental sustainability. The products that it sells provide an important means of recycling nature’s bounty in this sub-urban environment. They take the natural products of the earth and the by-products of our local economy and re-incorporate them into our surroundings. They turn the GREEN WASTE stream into products that usefully return to the environment. They make locally available garden products used by generations of Palo Altoans to beautify this great City.

Scope of Work
Please note that as part of the lease package, Cal Trans prepared and graded the site, applied the base rock and moved in the Trailer. Our work only included the erecting of the “lego block bulk storage bins and additional fencing along with the application of a screen along the fence.

The scope of work for this 1.98 acre site includes the following
- Minor site grading (previously prepared by Cal Trans)
- Application of base rock (previously prepared by Cal Trans)
- Erecting concrete “lego block” bulk material storage bins
- Installation of Modular 24’X60’ Office and showroom (previously prepared by Cal Trans)
- Additional fencing with screen
Existing and Proposed Uses

- Existing use – Cal Trans’ contractor construction yard for projects in the local area.
- Proposed use – Retail garden supply which was in operation in Palo Alto since 1959

Purpose of the proposed changes

- Relocation of business to new location

Materials, colors and construction methods

- Materials used on the site are all natural materials including base rock, concrete “lego blocks” utilizing recycled gravel and landscaping.

On behalf of Larry Ciardella and Bob Budelli, I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have regarding this great new home for a long standing business in Palo Alto

Sincerely

Richard Ciardella
Ciardella Associates