CITY OF HAYWARD

DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Notice is hereby given that the City of Hayward finds that the proposed project described in detail below would not have a significant effect on the environment as prescribed by the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended:

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Title: Dryden Court Single Family Home (Application No. 201600993)

Description: The proposed project includes Site Plan Review for construction of an approximately 4,200 square foot single family home and related site improvements on an approximately 0.7-acre (30,490 square feet) vacant parcel located at the terminus of Dryden Court.

The proposed project includes grading and development on slopes exceeding 30% within the vicinity of the development area. The project will minimize the height of retaining walls by incorporating below grade foundations and walls and stepping the design to follow the natural terrain. The proposed three-story home will range from 15 to 26 feet in height measured from the mid-point of the respective sloped roofs to the nearest adjacent grades. The project includes construction of an approximately 110 foot long curving driveway, landscaping, and extension of existing drainage ditches on the site to direct stormwater run-off. The proposed home will connect to existing utilities in Dryden Court.

Location: Terminus of Dryden Court; Assessor's Parcel Number: 081D-2086-064-00.

Approvals: Site Plan Review; Grading Permit

II. FINDING PROJECT WILL NOT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECT ENVIRONMENT:

The proposed project, with the mitigation measures included in the Initial Study prepared for this project, will not have a significant effect on the environment.

III. FINDINGS SUPPORTING DECLARATION:

1. The proposed project has been reviewed according to the standards and requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and an Initial Study Environmental Evaluation Checklist has been prepared for the proposed project. The Initial Study has determined that the proposed project, with the recommended mitigation measures, could not result in significant effects on the environment.

2. The project was found to have either no impact or less than significant impacts in the areas of Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology or Water Quality, Land Use, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation and Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems.

3. The project could result in impacts related to Geology and Soils in that new construction on the site with slopes ranging from 20 to over 30% could be susceptible to strong ground shaking or unstable soils created by planned cuts and fills. Impacts can be mitigated to a level of less than significant if construction level drawings include new foundation supports to extend to reach hard bedrock and all additional applicable Geotechnical Engineer recommendations set forth in the Summit Engineering report dated February 2016. Building permit plan submittal shall be accompanied by a design level report prepared by a licensed civil engineer that includes the following:
    - Review of the foundation, grading and drainage plans;
    - Inspection of excavation operations, and particularly those for drilled pier foundations, placement of fill and backfill materials and installation of surface drains and sub-drains behind retaining walls; and,
    - Preparation and submittal of a Final Soil's Engineer Report prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the structure that indicates whether construction was done according to expected soils characteristics, or new features were encountered which required special engineering conditions.

4. With regard to the Mandatory Findings of Significance, the proposed project could result in impacts that could cause an adverse effect on human beings as described above and in the attached Initial Study; however those impacts can be mitigated to a level of less than significant as described above and in the Initial Study.

IV. LEAD AGENCY REPRESENTATIVE AND PERSON WHO PREPARED THE INITIAL STUDY:

8/26/16

Leigha Schmidt, AICP, Senior Planner — Date

V. CONTACT INFORMATION

For additional information, please contact the project Planner, Leigha Schmidt at the City of Hayward Planning Division at 510-583-4113.

Written comments may be sent to Leigha Schmidt via email at leigha.schmidt@hayward-ca.gov or at City of Hayward Planning Division, 777 B Street, Hayward, CA 94541.

VI. COPY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Copies of the Initial Study are also available for public review at Hayward City Hall, at 777 B Street, Hayward on the First Floor Permitting Center, Monday through Thursday from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.; at the Hayward Public Library located at 835 C Street and the Weekes Branch Library located at 27300 Patrick Avenue in Hayward. Please see the Library and Community Services webpage at http://www.library.ci.hayward.ca.us/ for library days and hours.

Additionally, the Initial Study and all appendices are available on the City's website at http://www.hayward-ca.gov/content/projects-under-environmental-review-0.

CITY OF
HAYWARD
HEART OF THE BAY

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
Planning Division

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Project Title: Dryden Court Single Family Home (Application No. 201600993)

Lead agency name/address: City of Hayward, 777 B Street, Hayward CA 94541

Contact person: Leigha Schmidt, Senior Planner

Project location: Terminus Dryden Court; Assessor's Parcel Number: 081D-2086-064-00.

Project sponsor: Bijan Mashaw, 26886 Parkside Dr., Hayward, CA 94542

Existing General Plan Designation: Single Family Residential with Special Lot Standards Combining District, Minimum 6,000 Square Foot Lot (RSB6)

Existing Zoning: Suburban Density Residential (SDR)

Project Description: The proposed project includes Site Plan Review for construction of an approximately 4,200 square foot single family home and related site improvements on an approximately 0.7-acre (30,490 square feet) vacant parcel located at the terminus of Dryden Court.

The proposed project includes grading and development on slopes exceeding 30% within the vicinity of the development area. The project will minimize the height of retaining walls by incorporating below grade foundations and walls and stepping the design to follow the natural terrain. The proposed three-story home will range from 15 to 26 feet in height measured from the mid-point of the respective sloped roofs to the nearest adjacent grades. The project includes construction of an approximately 110 foot long curving driveway, landscaping, and extension of existing drainage ditches on the site to direct stormwater run-off. The proposed home will connect to existing utilities in Dryden Court.

Requested Local Approvals: The Lead Agency will take the following actions in order to carry out the project:

- Site Plan Review
- Grading Permit

Surrounding land uses and setting: The 0.7-acre project site is roughly rectangular in shape and steeply sloped from the north to the south (at Dryden Court). Surrounding land uses include single family

residential development and vacant land.

Other public agencies whose approval is required: None

Attachments
Attachment I - Aerial Map
Attachment II - Architectural Plans
Attachment III - Civil, Grading and Drainage Plans

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☒ Geology /Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality
☐ Land Use / Planning	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise
☐ Population / Housing	☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic	☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Leigha Schmidt, Senior Planner

8/26/16
Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐

There are no designated scenic vistas in the vicinity of the project, and the project has been designed specifically to protect the views afforded to neighboring properties and the right-of-way due to the location of the house on the property at the end of an approximately 110 foot long curved driveway and the stepped architectural design. Thus, less than significant impact.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project is not located within a state scenic highway, and it is fully development with an existing building and site improvements; thus, no impact (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/scenic_hwy.htm, accessed on August 23, 2016; Google Earth).

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The existing site is on a hillside with steeply sloped areas. The proposed home would feature a stepped design and would be built into the hillside thus reducing the visual impact of the large-scale single family home. Further, the home would be located on the southern portion of the site and would be accessed via an approximately 110 foot long curved driveway thus reducing the visibility and massing of the home from the public right-of-way. Grading would occur on the site with cuts and retaining walls that would be incorporated into the design of the home and hidden by the hillside. The only visible retaining wall (garage) would reach about nine feet in height. As designed, the project would not substantially degrade the character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Thus, less than significant impact.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

nighttime views in the area?

The proposed project would result in development of a currently vacant site and would thus introduce sources of new light to the site. However, the proposed single family home is consistent with surrounding development and will be subject to standard conditions of approval requiring that all exterior lighting be confined to the property and not cast direct light or glare onto adjacent properties. Thus the new development will result in a less than significant impact related to lighting and glare.

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

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

The project does not involve any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance; thus, no impact (Zoning Map, Google Earth).

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project is not zoned for agricultural uses nor is the property under Williamson Act contract; thus no impact (Zoning Map, Google Earth).

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project does not involve the rezoning of forest land or timberland; thus, no impact (Zoning Map, Google Earth).

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project does not involve the loss of forest land or involve conversion of forest land; thus, no impact (Zoning Map, Google Earth).

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would not result in a conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses nor would it result in conversion of any farmland (Zoning Map, Google Earth). Thus, no impact.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project involves development of a currently vacant parcel and will thus result in an increase in stationary and mobile source emissions over the baseline condition. However, the proposed project is consistent with the subject zoning and General Plan land use designation for the property, which envisioned the proposed development of a single family home. Development of the subject site with a single family home will not conflict with the goals of the regional air quality plan; thus less than significant impact.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) established screening criteria as part of their CEQA guidance to assist in determining if a proposed project could result in potentially significant construction-related or ongoing operational air quality impacts (BAAQMD 2011 CEQA Guidelines, Table 3.1, Operational-Related Criteria Air Pollutant and Precursor Screening Level Sizes). Based on the District's criteria, the proposed development consisting of development of one single family home is well below the screening level for a significant impact related to air quality impacts. Thus, less than significant impact.

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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As noted in III.a and III.b above, the proposed project is below the screening size for projects that are

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

expected to result in significant air pollutant emissions. Therefore emissions from the proposed project are expected to be well below the BAAQMD significance thresholds for both construction exhaust and operational emissions for regional criteria pollutants.

While the project falls below the potentially significant threshold, it is important to note that any construction activities, particularly during site preparation and grading, would temporarily generate fugitive dust in the form of PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$. Unless properly controlled, vehicles leaving the site would deposit mud on local streets, which could be an additional source of airborne dust after it dries. Standard conditions of approval related to construction activities to minimize fugitive dust and particulate matter will be incorporated into the project approval, thus less than significant impact.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project involves development of a currently vacant site with a new single family home. The site is located in a single family neighborhood and is surrounded by similar development and vacant land. There are no sources of pollutant concentrations near the site and the proposed single family home will not result in exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Thus no impact.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would not include any significant and permanent sources of significant odors (i.e. landfill, composting station, food manufacturer) that could create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Thus, no impact.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

The project site is composed of ruderal groundcover and scattered trees and is surrounded on the north, south and western boundaries by development (City of Hayward Background Conditions Report, Figure 7-1, Existing Vegetation Communities; Google Earth). Ruderal communities are generally composed of vacant parcels that have been disked or previously disturbed in some manner. While development of the site will result in permanent disturbance of a portion of the currently vacant site that likely hosts urban wildlife such as mice, gophers, squirrels among others, it will not have a substantial impact on any valuable habitat that is known to host candidate, sensitive or special status species. Thus, less than significant impact.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As noted above, the project site is located in an area identified as ruderal which is generally composed of vacant parcels that have been disked or previously disturbed in some manner. While development of the site with a single family home will result in permanent disturbance of a portion of the currently vacant site which is likely hosting some urban wildlife such as mice, gophers, squirrels and other small rodents, it will not have a substantial impact on any riparian habitat or other identified sensitive natural communities; thus, less than significant impact.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site does not contain any wetlands; thus, no impact (City of Hayward Background Conditions Report, Figure 7-1, Existing Vegetation Communities; Google Earth).

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

native wildlife nursery sites?

As noted above, the project site is located in an area identified as ruderal which is generally composed of vacant parcels that have been disked or previously disturbed in some manner. While development of the site with a single family home will result in permanent disturbance of a portion of the currently vacant site which is likely hosting some urban wildlife such as mice, gophers, squirrels and other small rodents, it will not eliminate a migratory wildlife corridor or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites due to the fact that the site is located at the end of a cul de sac with development on three sides in an existing residential neighborhood (Google Earth). Thus, less than significant impact.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As noted above, the site has a ruderal groundcover and scattered trees (City of Hayward Background Conditions Report, Figure 7-1, Existing Vegetation Communities; Google Earth). Several of the existing trees at the southern portion of the site will be removed to accommodate the proposed development (Google Earth, Site Plan). Tree removal is subject to the City of Hayward's Tree Preservation Ordinance which requires submittal of specific plans related to the tree species, size and health of those being removed and specifies replacement with equal value or equal size tree thus resulting in a less than significant impact related to tree removal.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The City of Hayward does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan; thus, no impact.

V. **CULTURAL RESOURCES** -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

There are no known historic resources associated with the site or the adjacent parcels (City of Hayward Background Conditions Report, Figures 1-3 and 1-4, and Table 1-2). In the unlikely event that historic or cultural resources are discovered during excavation related to later phases of the project, standard conditions of approval for all development projects require the contractor to stop all work adjacent to the find and contact the City of Hayward Development Services Department to preserve and record the uncovered materials (General Plan Policy Natural Resources (NR)-7.2).

If standard procedures are followed in the event cultural/historical resources are uncovered at the project site, there will be a less than significant impact related to the project (Hayward 2040 General Plan Background Report and City of Hayward Historical Resources Survey & Inventory Report, July 2010).

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No known archaeological resources exist on the site (City of Hayward Background Conditions Report, Figures 1-3 and 1-4, and Table 1-2). In the unlikely event that historical or cultural resources are discovered in later phases of work, standard conditions of approval for all development projects would apply as described in V.a above. If standard procedures are followed in the event cultural/historical resources are uncovered at the project site, there will be a less than significant impact related to the project (General Plan).

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐

No known paleontological resources exist on the site (City of Hayward Background Conditions Report, 7-137 and 7-138). Other than the steep slope which is characteristic of the surrounding area, there are no unique geological features on or near the site (Google Earth). In the unlikely event that paleontological resources are discovered during later phases of development, standard conditions of approval for all development projects would apply as described in V.a above.

If standard procedures are followed in the event cultural, historical or paleontological resources are uncovered at the project site, there will be a less than significant impact related to the project (General Plan).

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

cemeteries?

There is no recorded information related to the location of known human remains or cemeteries near the project site; however, standard procedures for grading operations shall be followed during development, which require that if any such remains or resources are discovered, grading operations shall be halted, the City and County Coroner shall be notified and the resources/remains shall be evaluated by a qualified professional. Further, if necessary, mitigation plans shall be formulated and implemented prior to commencement of grading operations (General Plan Policy NR-7.2). These standard measures would be conditions of approval should the project be approved thus resulting in a less than significant impact related to the potential disturbance of human remains.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☒	☐	☐

The project site is not located on or near a known earthquake fault nor is it located within a seismic hazard area or within the State's Earthquake Fault Zone (Hayward 2040 General Plan Background Report, Figure 9-1). However, Hayward is located in a seismically active region and a major earthquake could be expected to occur in the future that would expose people and property to strong seismic ground shaking, liquefaction and soil instability, even outside of known areas. It is essential to note that all structures will be designed using sound engineering judgment and adhere to the latest California Building Code (CBC) requirements which will minimize impacts related to such activity but site specific mitigation is required to minimize these impacts due to the heavily sloped topography.

According to a Geotechnical Feasibility Study Report prepared by GFK & Associates (August 2015) and a subsequent Update Geotechnical and Soil Investigation Report was prepared by Summit Engineering (October 2015), the proposed site is suitable for the proposed residence provided that new foundation supports are extended to reach hard bedrock among other recommendations in the report. However, as noted in the Geotechnical and Soil Investigation Report, the report's conclusions were general in nature and additional recommendations were provided to reduce geological-related

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

hazards to a less than significant impact.

Geo-1 Impact: New construction on the subject site which has slopes between 20 and over 30% could be susceptible to strong ground shaking or unstable soils created by planned cuts and fills in the existing steeply sloped site.

Geo-1 Mitigation Measure: Construction level drawings prepared for the proposed residence shall include new foundation supports to extend to reach hard bedrock, and complies with all Geotechnical Engineer recommendations set forth in the Summit Engineering report dated February 2016. Building permit plan submittal shall be accompanied by a design level report prepared by a licensed civil engineer that includes the following:

- Review of the foundation, grading and drainage plans;
- Inspection of excavation operations, and particularly those for drilled pier foundations, placement of fill and backfill materials and installation of surface drains and sub-drains behind retaining walls; and,
- Preparation and submittal of a Final Soil's Engineer Report prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the structure that indicates whether construction was done according to expected soils characteristics, or new features were encountered which required special engineering conditions.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☒	☐	☐

See VI.a. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☒	☐	☐

See VI.a. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.

iv) Landslides?	☐	☒	☐	☐

According to the Geotechnical Feasibility Study Report prepared by GFK Associates, investigation into the site does not reveal a record of or potential for landslides. Compliance with **Mitigation Measure Geo-1** will ensure that all the construction-level design will minimize any potential landslide related impacts to level of less than significant.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

loss of topsoil?

The project will be subject to standard planning and building permit review and inspection processes that would require standard construction-related erosion control measures set forth in the Hayward Municipal Code (HMC), including but not limited to gravelling construction entrances and protecting drain inlets. Thus, the potential impacts to soil erosion or loss of topsoil is considered less than significant.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☒	☐	☐

As noted in VI.a.i above, the proposed project site is vulnerable to unstable geological activity. Implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would reduce the impact to a level of less than significant.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☒	☐	☐

According to a Geotechnical Feasibility Study Report prepared by GFK & Associates (August 2015) and a subsequent Update Geotechnical and Soil Investigation Report was prepared by Summit Engineering (October 2015), the proposed site is suitable for the proposed residence provided that new foundation supports are extended to reach hard bedrock among other recommendations set forth in the Summit Engineering report dated February 2016. In addition, as noted in VI.a.iii above, implementation of **Mitigation Measure GEO-1** would reduce the impact of unstable soils to a level of less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project would not involve the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. Thus, no impact.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS -- Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The BAAQMD has established screening criteria as part of their CEQA guidance to assist in determining if a proposed project could result in operational-related impacts to Greenhouse Gases. The project involves the construction of a single family home with associated grading (Project Description). Single-family home projects with less than 56 dwelling units have been identified by the BAAQMD Air Quality Guidelines as having emissions less than 1,100 metric tons of CO^2e per year which is below the threshold recommended by the Air District for evaluation of greenhouse gas emissions for new land use projects; thus less than significant impact.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As discussed in VII.a above, the project will not exceed the threshold for operational greenhouse gases. Further, the project would not conflict with the City's adopted Climate Action Plan and General Plan policies and programs adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG; thus, no impact.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project which involves construction of a single family home and related grading activity would not involve the transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials; thus, no impact.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				

The project which involves construction of a single family home and related grading activity would not involve the use of hazardous materials that could result in the release of hazardous materials into the environment; thus, no impact.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project which involves construction of a single family home and related grading activity and would not emit hazardous emissions nor would it result in the handling of hazardous materials; thus, no impact.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project site is located in a residential area and is surrounded by single family residential development. The site is not listed on the State of California's Department of Toxic Substances Control's Envirostor webpage (http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?basic=True, assessed August 24, 2016). Thus, no impact.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The site is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip and therefore, no such impacts would occur as a result of the project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The site is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip and therefore, no such impacts would occur as a result of the project.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; thus, no impact.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project site is located within the City of Hayward Wildland/Urban Interface Area, and will be required to meet the construction requirements set forth in the City of Hayward Hillside Design and Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines, including but not limited to installation of Class A roofing materials, exterior non-combustible siding materials, installation of double-pane windows, and compliance with requirements contained in the 2013 California Residential Code Section R327, as conditions of approval for the project. With implementation of these design and construction features, the proposed development would have a less than significant impact related to exposure of people or structures to wildland fire risk.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Construction and grading activity would result in the disturbance of soil. Depending on the dates of proposed grading activity, the applicant will be required to submit a grading permit and comply with an Erosion Control Plan which will be monitored by the City's Public Works Department, as a standard condition of approval. The proposed project would also be subject to the county-wide Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) to manage post-construction stormwater runoff with Low Impact Development methods such as directing runoff into cisterns, rain barrels or vegetated areas (Site Plan, C1.0).

The project would comply with state and local water quality and discharge requirements, resulting in a less than significant impact related to a degradation of water quality; thus, less than significant impact and no additional mitigation is required.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project will be connected to the existing water supply and will not involve the use of water wells and will not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge; thus, no impact.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

There are no streams or rivers on or within the boundaries of the project site. The proposed project consists of construction of a new single family home and a driveway which would result in introduction of impervious areas on about 17% of the site (5,155 square feet). Currently run-off from the upper part of the site flows to an existing concrete V-ditch that drains to a catch basin/manhole near Dobbel Avenue. The lower part of the site sheet flows to Dryden Court.

According to a Hydrologic Report prepared for the project by Eric Cox, Registered Professional Engineer (July 2016), run-off from the upper part of the site where no development is proposed would continue to be directed to the Dobbel Avenue catchbasin/manhole while the lower part of the site where the development is proposed would direct run-off using a series of connected V-ditches and

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

various methods for minimizing stormwater run-off including directing run-off to rocky dissipaters, terraced landscape areas and into rain barrels. Ultimately, the V-ditches would direct run-off from the lower portion of the site to Dryden Court however the volume of run-off would reach about five to six gallons of water per minute or about 10% more than existing conditions, which is not considered a significant increase in drainage that could result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐

There are no streams or rivers on or within the boundaries of the project site. The infill site is substantially surrounded by development and water drains into existing storm water drainage facilities. As noted in IX.c above, drainage from the proposed development would be managed through a series of V-ditches and directed into landscaped and self-retaining areas to minimize post-development run-off. The minimal increase in post-development run-off would result in a less than significant impact related to flooding on or off the site.

e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐

See IX.c and IX.d above.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐

See IX.a, IX.c and IX.d above.

g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area; thus, no impact (FEMA Flood Map

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Panel No. 06001C0293G, effective August 3, 2009).

h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area; thus, no impact (FEMA Flood Map Panel No. 06001C0293G, effective August 3, 2009).

i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Further, the site is not located in proximity to any known dam or levee thus there is no impact related to flooding from such a facility (FEMA Flood Map Panel No. 06001C0293G, effective August 3, 2009 and Hayward 2040 General Plan Background Report Figure 9-5, Hayward Dam Inundation Areas).

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is not located within 100-year flood hazard area. Further, it is located approximately six miles from the San Francisco Bay thus the potential impacts related to inundation are less than significant. (FEMA Flood Map Panel No. 06001C0293G, effective August 3, 2009 and Google Earth)

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:	☐	☐	☐	☒
a) Physically divide an established community?				

The proposed project involves construction of a single family home and related grading on an existing vacant lot that is zoned for single family residential development. The site is surrounded by single family development and would not physically divide an established community; thus, no impact.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project involves construction of a single family home on an existing vacant lot in a single family neighborhood. The proposed development is consistent with the density and lot size of the Suburban Density Residential General Plan land use designation, the standards set forth in the applicable Single Family Residential (RS) District and the proposed house design is consistent with the applicable Hillside Design Guidelines in that the house would exhibit a stepped design to follow the natural terrain. Thus, the proposed development will result in no impact related to conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The City of Hayward does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan; thus, no impact.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒

There are no known mineral resources on the project site; thus, no impact (Hayward 2040 General Plan Background Report).

See XI.a.	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:				
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?				

The project involves construction of a new single family residence and related grading in an existing residential neighborhood. The proposed use is not expected to generate a substantial increase in the permanent ambient noise levels above standards established in the General Plan or already existing in the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed project site is not located near any roadway segments identified as significant noise generators (Hayward General Plan Background Report, Table 9-11, Summary of Modeled Existing Traffic Noise Levels). Thus, less than significant impact related to the proposed project resulting in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of adopted standards.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

A significant impact related to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels would occur if the construction of later phases of the proposed project would expose people to vibration levels exceeding 0.3 inches per second peak particle velocity (in/sec PPV).

Project construction activities related to grading activities will generate vibration in the immediate vicinity of the work area. Vibration levels from periods of heavy construction are anticipated to be 0.1 in/sec PPV or less at a distance of 50 feet from construction. The nearest point of grading activity for the driveway would be about twenty feet from the existing residential development just south of the project site thus the potential increase may be in the realm of 0.2 to 0.25 in/sec PPV, which is considered a less than significant impact related to groundbourne vibration and noise levels.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐

See XII.a above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project would result in temporary increase in noise related to construction activities. Noise generated by construction activities would temporarily elevate noise levels at adjacent noise sensitive receptors, but this would be considered a less-than-significant impact, because construction activities shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the HMC Section 4-1.03.4 which includes construction best management practices specifically described in conditions of approval for the project. Thus, temporary noise impacts related to construction would be less than significant.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The site is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip and therefore, no such impacts would occur as a result of the project.

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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The site is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip and therefore, no such impacts would occur as a result of the project.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				

The proposed project involves construction of a single family home and related grading on an existing vacant lot in an established single family residential neighborhood. The project would not induce substantial population growth either directly or indirectly and is consistent with the General Plan. Thus, less than significant impact.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project involves construction of a new single family home and related grading activity on a currently vacant lot and would thus not involve displacement of any existing housing. Thus, no impact.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project involves construction of a new single family home and related grading activity on a currently vacant lot and would thus not involve displacement of any people. Thus, no impact.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES --

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 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:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

The proposed project involves construction of a single family home and related grading on a currently vacant lot in an established single family residential neighborhood. The project would not require the construction or expansion of fire protection facilities beyond those already planned under General Plan assumptions. Thus the proposed development will have a less than significant impact related to fire protection.

Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Although construction of the new home and occupation of the currently vacant site would incrementally increase the demand for police services, the proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of police protection facilities beyond those already planned under the General Plan assumptions. Thus the proposed development will have a less than significant impact related to police protection.

Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is located within the Hayward Unified School District and the developer will be required to pay school impact mitigation fees at the time of building permit issuance, which is considered full mitigation pursuant to State Law. Thus impacts related to schools are considered less than significant.

Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The project proponent would be required to pay park dedication in-lieu fees pursuant to HMC Chapter 10, Article 16, Property Developers - Obligations for Parks and Recreation, thus reducing the project's impact to a level of less than significant.

Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project site is infill and surrounded by development including roads, streetlights and other public facilities. The proposed project will not result in a need for any public facilities beyond those already planned under General Plan assumptions. Thus the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to other public facilities.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. RECREATION --				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project involves construction of a new single family home and related grading activity on an existing vacant lot in an established residential neighborhood. The majority of the approximately 30,400 site would be undeveloped open space thus providing ample on-site recreation and open space (albeit on a sloped terrain) for the residents of the home. In addition, as noted above, the project proponent would be required to pay park dedication in-lieu fees thus reducing the project's impact to a level of less than significant. While the construction of the new home would likely increase the use of existing parks by adding new residents to the community, it is not anticipated that the minor increase in population would result in substantial deterioration of such facilities. Thus the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact on recreational facilities.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As noted in XV.a above, the proposed project would result in a significant amount of on-site open space and would be subject to applicable park in-lieu fees, therefore, the impacts to recreational facilities are considered less than significant.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				

The traffic generated from construction of a new single family home within an established residential neighborhood is not sufficient to warrant further study and is not expected to result in any discernible impact to the surrounding circulation patterns. Thus, no impact.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways.	☐	☐	☐	☒

No intersection level of service will be impacted by the construction of a single family home on a vacant lot in an established residential neighborhood; thus, no impact.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project involves no changes to air traffic patterns; thus, no impact.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The project has been designed to meet all City standards and requirements and will not increase any identified or foreseen hazards; thus, no impact.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

The proposed single family home would be located on a site that is accessible from an existing roadway (Dryden Court). In addition, the home would be sited within 125 feet of the front property line and would therefore be within the range of fire service hoses. Thus no impact is anticipated with regard to emergency access.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The proposed project does not involve any conflicts with or changes to policies, plans or programs related to transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities; thus, no impact.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

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

Sanitary sewage from the City's system is treated at the Hayward Water Pollution Control Facility (WPCF) which discharges into the San Francisco Bay under a permit with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). As a standard condition of approval, the proposed new development will be required to connect to the City's service which currently ends at the terminus of Dryden Court. The proposed development consists of construction of one single family home on a vacant lot surrounded by an established residential neighborhood and would not result in exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the WPCF Thus less than significant impact.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project is located within the City's water and wastewater service boundaries. As noted in XVII.a above, the proposed project would result in a minimal increase in wastewater and would not require construction of or expansion of wastewater treatment facilities. With regard to water

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

demand, the proposed single family use was anticipated under the current General Plan and the City's Water Master Plan (Hayward 2040 General Plan Background Report, 8-3).

The proposed project would not require construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities; thus, less than significant impact.

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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As described in IX.c related to hydrology and stormwater run-off, the proposed project will involve a series of V-ditches to collect and convey run-off from the proposed development and direct it into landscaped areas and ultimately to Dryden Court. The overall increase in run-off flowing from the site would result in a minor increase over existing conditions and would result in a less than significant impact and would not require the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As noted in XVII.b above, the proposed project was anticipated in the General Plan and in the City's Water Master Plan (Hayward 2040 General Plan Background Report, 8-3); thus, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to water supplies.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐

See XVII.a and b above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐

There is sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed project and waste from the City of Hayward at Altamont Landfill through 2024. Solid waste generated by the project would contribute incrementally to the use of the landfill capacity. The City of Hayward has adopted City-wide policies and ordinances (see HMC Chapter 5, Article 1, Solid Waste Collection and Disposal) intended to maximize the City's diversion rate from landfills. Adherence to these policies will result in a less than significant impact.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

See XVII.f above. The project would be subject to all adopted City regulations related to solid waste and there is adequate capacity at the Altamont Landfill to accommodate the proposed project. Thus, the project would result in a less than significant impact related to solid waste.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The proposed project involves construction of a single family home and related grading on a vacant site in an established residential neighborhood. While construction of the home would result in the removal and replacement of some trees, the impact related to such removal can be mitigated through

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

implementation of the City's existing Tree Preservation Ordinance. In addition, the site is covered with a ruderal land cover and has been disturbed and disked in the past. While urban wildlife is likely present on the site, it does not have adequate or documented habitat for any identified, endangered or otherwise protected species. Further, there is no evidence of any cultural or paleontological resources at or near the site although standard General Plan policies and conditions related to halting work and reporting a find is required per local and State law. Thus, the impact is less than significant.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

A lead agency shall find that a project may have a significant effect on the environment where there is substantial evidence that the project has potential environmental effects "that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable." As defined in Section 15065(a)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines, cumulatively considerable means "that the incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects." The proposed project involves construction of one single family home in an established residential neighborhood and would not result in an impact that would be cumulatively considerable over existing conditions. Thus less than significant impact.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

As described in **Impact Geo-1**, the proposed project could be susceptible to strong ground shaking or unstable soils created by planned cuts and fills in the existing steeply sloped site; however, implementation of **Mitigation Measure Geo-1** will minimize those risks through design and field verifications. With the implementation of standard measures and conditions of approval identified and described throughout this study, the proposed single family development would not result in substantial adverse impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Thus less than significant impact.

SOURCES

Professional judgement and expertise of the individual that prepared this initial study based upon review if the site and surrounding conditions and project plans.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District. *California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines.* May 2011.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District Updated CEQA Guidelines, http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/updated-ceqa-guidelines, accessed on August 25, 2016.

City of Hayward 2040 General Plan

City of Hayward 2040 General Plan Background Report, January 2014

City of Hayward Geographic Information Systems (http://webmap.hayward-ca.gov/)

City of Hayward Hillside Design and Urban/Wildland Interface Guidelines

City of Hayward Municipal Code

Hydrology, Storm Water and Best Management Program for a New Residence at 2626 Dryden Court. Prepared by Eric Cos, Registered Professional Engineer. (July 2016)

FEMA Flood Map Panel No. 06001C0293G, August 3, 2009. FEMA Flood Map Service Center: Search by Address. http://msc.fema.gov/portal/search, accessed on August 24, 2016

Geotechnical Feasibility Study Report prepared by GFK & Associates (August 2015)

Google Earth

State of California, Department of Conservation, Regulatory Maps. http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=regulatorymaps, accessed on March 11, 2016

State of California's Department of Toxic Substances Control's Envirostor webpage (http://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/search.asp?basic=True, assessed March 14, 2016

State of California, Department of Transportation, Scenic Highway Routes, http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/scenic_hwy.htm, accessed on March 8, 2016

Update Geotechnical and Soil Investigation Report, Summit Engineering (October 2015)


SITE
Dryden Ct
Dryden Ct
© 2016 Google
Google earth
1993
Imagery Date: 10/30/2015 37°39'09.30" N 122°02'33.77" W elev 707 ft eye alt 1137 ft

VIEW FROM STREET

VIEW FROM WEST NEIGHBOR

VIEW FROM EAST NEIGHBOR

LICENSED ARCHITECT + STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Ronald Huber
Exp. 8/31/2016
Ren. May 2015

DR Design Review

No.	Date	Issue Notes

No.	Date	Revision Notes	Zone	Appr

Designed By
Drawn By
Checked By
Reviewed By RAH
Submitted By BM
Project Manager

Date 5/9/2016
Revision Revision
Project ID 2015012
Drawing Code Drawing Code
CAD File Name MRHplanSD6.vwx
Plot Date 00/00/00

Design Firm
RONALD HUBER - AIA
CA Architect C18,126
10 Skylark Drive #4
Larkspur CA 94938 / 415 866-0515

Consultant

Project Title
NEW DRYDEN CT. RESIDENCE
2626 Dryden Court, Hayward CA
Owner: BIJAN MISHAW
510 733-6656

Sheet Title
PERSPECTIVES & ELEVATIONS

Scale

Sheet No.
2
of
9

1
A8

GARAGE
723'0" asl
GROUND FLOOR

DRIVEWAY

up

28'-3"

3'-6"

23'-11"

D-01

No.	Date	Issue Notes
		DR Design Review

No.	Date	Revision Notes	Zone	Appr

LICENSED ARCHITECT + Ronald Huber C 18,126 Ren. Nov 2017 + STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Date 5/9/2016
Revision Revision
Project ID 2015012
Drawing Code Drawing Code
CAD File Name MRHplansS06.vwx
Plot Date 00/00/00

Designed By
Drawn By
Checked By
Reviewed By RAH
Submitted By BM
Project Manager

Design Firm
RONALD HUBER - AIA
CA Architect C18,126
10 Skylark Drive #4
Larkspur CA 94938 / 415 866-0515

Consultant

Project Title
NEW DRYDEN CT. RESIDENCE
2626 Dryden Court, Hayward CA
Owner: BIJAN MISHAW
510 733-6656

Sheet Title
GARAGE FLOOR PLAN

Scale

Sheet No.
3
of
9



FIRST FLOOR PLAN

Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

LICENSED ARCHITECT + CALIFORNIA + STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Ronald Huber
C 18126
Ren. May 2015

DR Design Review

No.	Date	Issue Notes

No.	Date	Revision Notes

Zone

Appr

Design Firm
RONALD HUBER - AIA
CA Architect C18,126
10 Skylark Drive #4
Larkspur CA 94938 / 415 866-0515

Consultant

Project Title
NEW DRYDEN CT. RESIDENCE
2626 Dryden Court, Hayward CA
Owner: BIJAN MISHAW
510 733-6656

Sheet Title
1ST FLOOR PLAN

Scale

Sheet No.
4
of
9

Designed By	
Drawn By	
Checked By	
Reviewed By	RAH
Submitted By	BM
Project Manager	
Date	5/9/2016
Revision	Revision
Project ID	2015012
Drawing Code	Drawing Code
CAD File Name	MR-HplansSD6.vwx
Plot Date	00/00/00

SECOND FLOOR PLAN

Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

RAH

No.	Date	Revision Notes	Zone	Appr

LICENSED ARCHITECT + VINNOVATOR + STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Ronald Huber
C 18 126
Ren. Nov 2015

DR Design Review

Issue Notes

No.	Date

Designed By
Drawn By
Checked By
Reviewed By RAH
Submitted By BM
Project Manager

Date 5/9/2016
Revision Revision
Project ID 2015012
Drawing Code Drawing Code
CAD File Name MRHplanSD6.vwx
Plot Date 00/00/00

Design Firm
RONALD HUBER - AIA
CA Architect C18,126
10 Skylark Drive #4
Larkspur CA 94938 / 415 866-0515

Consultant

Project Title
NEW DRYDEN CT. RESIDENCE
2626 Dryden Court, Hayward CA
Owner: BIJAN MISHAW
510 733-6656

Sheet Title
2ND FLOOR PLAN

Scale

Sheet No.
5
of
9



ROOF PLAN

Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

No.	Date	Revision Notes	Zone	Appr

Ronald Huber
Lic. # C18126
Ren. May 2015
LICENSED ARCHITECT + CALIFORNIA + STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DR Design Review

Issue Notes

Date	5/9/2016
Revision	Revision
Project ID	2015012
Drawing Code	Drawing Code
CAD File Name	MRHplanSD6.vwx
Plot Date	00/00/00

Designed By	
Drawn By	
Checked By	
Reviewed By	RAH
Submitted By	BM
Project Manager	

Design Firm
RONALD HUBER - AIA
CA Architect C18126
10 Skylark Drive #4
Larkspur CA 94938 / 415 866-0515

Consultant

Project Title
NEW DRYDEN CT. RESIDENCE
2626 Dryden Court, Hayward CA
Owner: BIJAN MISHAW
510 733-6656

Sheet Title
ROOF PLAN

Scale

Sheet No.
6
of
9



1 A6 WEST ELEVATION
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

2 A6 SOUTH ELEVATION
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

LICENSED ARCHITECT + STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Ronald Huber
C18,126
Ren. Nov 2015

DR Design Review

No.	Date	Issue Notes

No.	Date	Revision Notes	Zone	Appr

Date 5/9/2016
Revision Revision
Project ID 2015012
Drawing Code Drawing Code
CAD File Name MR\PlanSt06.vwx
Plot Date 00/00/00

Designed By
Drawn By
Checked By RAH
Reviewed By
Submitted By BM
Project Manager

Design Firm
RONALD HUBER - AIA
CA Architect C18,126
10 Skylark Drive #4
Larkspur CA 94938 / 415 866-0515

Consultant

Project Title
NEW DRYDEN CT. RESIDENCE
2626 Dryden Court, Hayward CA
Owner: BIJAN MISHAW
510 733-6656

Sheet Title
SOUTH & WEST ELAVATIONS

Scale

Sheet No.
7
of
9

1 A7 EAST ELEVATION
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"



2 A7 NORTH ELEVATION
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

DR Design Review

No.	Issue Notes	Date

No.	Revision Notes	Date	Zone	Appr

LICENSED ARCHITECT + VINSON + STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Ronald Huber
C18 126
Ren. Nov 2015

Date 02/18/2015
Revision Revision
Project ID 2015012
Drawing Code Drawing Code
CAD File Name MRHplansSD6.vwx
Plot Date 00/00/00

Designed By
Drawn By
Checked By RAH
Reviewed By
Submitted By BM
Project Manager

Design Firm
RONALD HUBER - AIA
CA Architect C18,126
10 Skylark Drive #4
Larkspur CA 94938 / 415 866-0515

Consultant

Project Title
NEW DRYDEN CT. RESIDENCE
2626 Dryden Court, Hayward CA
Owner: BIJAN MISHAW
510 733-6656

Sheet Title
NORTH & EASY ELEVATIONS

Scale

Sheet No.
8
of
9



SECTION B-B'



SECTION A-A'

Appr	
Zone	
Revision Notes	
Date	
No.	
Issue Notes	DR Design Review
Date	
No.	

Licensed Architect + State of California — Ronald Huber — Cert. # 26126 — Ren. May 2015

Designed By	
Drawn By	
Checked By	
Reviewed By	RAH
Submitted By	BM
Project Manager	
Date	05/9/2016
Revision	Revision
Project ID	2015012
Drawing Code	Drawing Code
CAD File Name	\MRH\plan\SD6.vwx
Plot Date	00/00/00

Design Firm
RONALD HUBER - AIA
CA Architect C18,126
10 Skylark Drive #4
Larkspur CA 94938 / 415 866-0515

Consultant

Project Title
NEW DRYDEN CT. RESIDENCE
2626 Dryden Court, Hayward CA
Owner: BIJAN MISHAW
510 733-6656

Sheet Title
SECTIONS A & B

Scale

Sheet No.
9
of
9

Attachment VI



NOTES:
1. Grate capacity = 1 c.f.s. with 2" head unclogged.
2. See sheet 3 for alternate installation without area drain box.
3. Products manufactured by Christy Concrete Products Inc., Brooks Product Inc. or Santa Rosa Cast Products Co. or equal may be utilized if approved by the City Engineer.

2 STANDARD AREA DRAIN
NOT TO SCALE

NOTES:
- DIRECT RUNOFF INTO CISTERNS OR RAIN BARREL FOR USE.
- DIRECT ROOF RUNOFF ONTO VEGETATED AREAS
- DIRECT RUNOFF DRIVEWAYS, WALKWAYS, OR PATIOS ONTO VEGETATED AREAS.

1 SITE DEVELOPMENT KEY PLAN
Scale: 1" = 10'-0"

EXISTING GRADES & PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
SEE ENLARGED PLANS FOR FINER DETAIL VIEWS

3 RECTANGULAR PIPE SECTION
NOT TO SCALE

Dimension H	Dimension W	Maximum Capacity
3	5	0.37 Cubic ft. per second
4	6	0.70 Cubic ft. per second
3	9	0.75 Cubic ft. per second
3	12.5	1.09 Cubic ft. per second
4	8.5	1.07 Cubic ft. per second
4	14	1.93 Cubic ft. per second

4 LONGITUDINAL SECTION W/ PLANTER AREA
NOT TO SCALE

GENERAL NOTES:
1. For greater capacity, additional adjacent drains may be installed with the following limitations:
   (a) Adjacent drains shall be of one type.
   (b) Minimum distance between drains shall be 4".
2. All capacities are based on the following: (a) S=¼" to 1' flowing full and (b) n=0.011 for duct and pipe sections.
3. Plastic pipe shall not be used in planter areas unless pipe is encased in concrete as shown on Plastic Pipe Section on this sheet.
4. Only gravity flow shall be permitted through curb drains. Pumped discharge through curb drains is not permitted.
5. Drain pipe shall not extend through driveway approaches. Drain pipe is allowed only in sidewalk sections.

No pipe joints shall be made within the sidewalk or curb.

REVISIONS	BY
1 MAY 19, 2016	
2 JULY 8, 2016	

REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER — No. C.E. 24162 — CIVIL — STATE OF CALIFORNIA

13 July 2016

KEMBCON ENGINEERS
CIVIL AND STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 389
MILLBRAE, CA 94030
VOICE 650.343.8310
FAX 650.689.5242
EMAIL: engineers@kembcon.com

New Single Family Home
2626 Dryden Court
Hayward, CA
94542

SITE PLAN

DATE: 1-DEC-15
SCALE: AS SHOWN
DRAWN: ---
PAGE:
C1.0

Attachment VI



6" DEEP VEE-DITCH WITH 1" TO 3" COBBLE STONES
4'-0"
6"
4'-0" WIDE X 6" DEEP VEE-DITCH TYPICAL
BUBBLER &
RIP-RAP 4" TO 6" QUARRY ROCKS
6"Ø HDPE
AREA DRAIN GRATE @ 708.5 INV.@ 707.0
COBBLES
STANDARD AREA DRAIN (SD-118,2 OF 5) SEE DET. 2,3,4/C1.0
STACK BLOCK WALL HEAD WALL
3"X12.5" CI PIPE PER RECTANGULAR PIPE PER SD 118
AREA DRAIN GRATE @ 704.5 INV.@ 703.5
FIRE HYDRANT
5'-0"
CO
4"Ø HDPE
AD
SLAB ON GRADE
UP
BUBBLER
GRATE @ 724 INV.@ 723
GARAGE
722 FINISH GROUND FLOOR SLAB
DOWNSPOUT TYPICAL
3" COBBLES
DOWNSPOUT TYPICAL
COBBLES
4" PVC PIPE TYPICAL
8.0' WIDE WALK WITH 3" DISINTEGRATED GRANITE DRESSING
2X4 HEADER BOARD WITH 2X2 STAKES @ 32" O.C.
AREA DRAIN GRATE @ 719.5 INV.@ 718
VEE-DITCH
3.5' HIGH RET. WALL
4"Ø SANITARY SEWER PIPE
(N)SS
GRATE @ 711.5 INV.@ 708
(E) WALL
3' CLEAR
8'-8"
RIP-RAP 4" TO 6" QUARRY ROCKS
3' MIN. DISTANCE OF ROAD FROM PROPERTY LINE
VAULT GRATE @ 710.5 INV.@ 707.6
INGRESS & EGRESS EASEMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF PARCEL 2 SHOWN MOTTLED
INGRESS & EGRESS EASEMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF PARCEL 1 SHOWN HATCHED
35.90'
44.61'
162
GAS
ELEC.
LEGEND:
CONCRETE WALL
STACKED BLOCK GRAVITY WALL
CONCRETE VEE DITCH
RIP RAP
CONCRETE FLATWORK
FH FIRE HYDRANT
CO CLEANOUT

1 ENLARGED DRIVEWAY GRADING PLAN
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

REVISIONS	BY
1 MAY 19, 2016	
2 JULY 8, 2016	

7/13/2016

KEMBCON ENGINEERS
CIVIL AND STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 389
MILLBRAE, CA 94030
VOICE 650.343.8310
FAX 650.689.5247
EMAIL: engineers@kembcon.com

New Single Family Home
2626 Dryden Court
Hayward, CA
94542

ENLARGE SITE GRADING PLAN

DATE: 1-DEC-15
SCALE: AS SHOWN
DRAWN: ---
PAGE:
C1.1

Attachment VI

REVISIONS	BY
1 MAY 19, 2016	
2 JULY 8, 2016	

7/13/2016

KEMBCON ENGINEERS
CIVIL AND STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 389
MILLBRAE, CA 94030
VOICE 650.343.8310
FAX 650.689.5242
EMAIL: engineers@kembcon.com

New Single Family Home
2626 Dryden Court
Hayward, CA
94542

ENLARGE SITE GRADING
PLAN @ FIRST FLOOR

TOP OF CONCRETE WALL @ 746
4' RETAINED EARTH
VEE-DITCH
DOWNSPOUT
CRAWL SPACE
STUD WALLS ABOVE CONCRETE WALL
CONC. WALL TO HERE
TOP OF CONCRETE WALL @ 742
STORAGE
PR
Closet
LIVING ROOM
734
FIRST FLOOR
TOP OF CONCRETE WALL @ 736
BATH
HALL
up
(S O G) GRADE ELEV. = 734
DINING ROOM
TOP OF CONCRETE WALL @ 736
CONCRETE WALL TO HERE
2 % SLOPE
(S O G) GRADE ELEV. = 732
TOP OF CONCRETE WALL @ 736
VEE-DITCH
DOWNSPOUT
3" COBBLES
GUEST ROOM
EL = 734
DECK @1ST FLR. SOG
EL = 733.4
DECK 733.5
SLAB ON GRADE
731.6
730.4
2 % SLOPE
FAMILY ROOM
732.2
FIRST FLOOR
3" COBBLES
GRATE @ 730
INV.@ 723.50
GRATE @ 727
INV.@ 723.2
4" PVC
CO
4"Ø HDPE
SLAB ON GRADE
728.6
724
KITCHEN
PANTRY
DECK
BUBBLER
GRATE @ 724
INV.@ 723
(N)SS
VEE-DITCH
GRATE @ 738.75
INV.@ 737
4"Ø PIPE
THRU WALL
SPLASH BLOCK
DOWNSPOUT TYPICAL
AREA DRAIN
RIP-RAP
4" TO 6" QUARRY ROCKS
4'-0" WIDE VEE-DITCH X 6" DEEP WITH COBBLES
RIP-RAP

1 ENLARGED SITE GRADING PLAN @ FIRST FLOOR
Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

DATE:	1-DEC-15
SCALE:	AS SHOWN
DRAWN:	---
PAGE:	C1.2

Attachment VI

REVISIONS	BY
1 MAY 19, 2016	
2 JULY 8, 2016	

7/13/2016

KEMBCON ENGINEERS
CIVIL AND STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 389
MILLBRAE, CA 94030
VOICE 650.343.8310
FAX 650.689.5242
EMAIL: engineers@kembcon.com

New Single Family Home
2626 Dryden Court
Hayward, CA
94542

ENLARGE SITE GRADING
PLAN @ SECOND FLOOR



1 ENLARGED SITE GRADING PLAN @ SECOND FLOOR

Scale: 1/4" = 1'-0"

DATE:	1-DEC-15
SCALE:	AS SHOWN
DRAWN:	---
PAGE:	C1.3



1 SECTION 1-1 @ ROAD 706.00 ELEVATION
Scale: 1/2"=1'0"



2 SECTION 2-2 @ ROAD 715.00 ELEVATION
Scale: 1/2"=1'0"

REVISIONS	BY
1 MAY 19, 2016	
2 JULY 8, 2016	

7/13/2016

KEMBCON ENGINEERS
CIVIL AND STRUCTURAL ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 389
MILLBRAE, CA 94030
VOICE 650.343.8310
FAX 650.689.5242
EMAIL: engineers@kembcon.com

Single Family Home
2626 Dryden Court
Hayward, CA
94542

SECTIONS

DATE:	1-DEC-15
SCALE:	AS SHOWN
DRAWN:	---
PAGE:	NEW SHEET 2

C1.4

MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM

DRYDEN COURT SINGLE FAMILY HOME

CITY OF HAYWARD

August 2016

P R E F A C E

Section 21081 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires a Lead Agency to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring or Reporting Program whenever it approves a project for which measures have been required to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The purpose of the monitoring or reporting program is to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures during project implementation.

The Initial Study concluded that the implementation of the project could result in significant effects on the environment and mitigation measures were incorporated into the proposed project or are required as a condition of project approval. This Mitigation Monitoring or Reporting Program addresses those measures in terms of how and when they will be implemented.

This document does *not* discuss those subjects for which the Initial Study concluded that the impacts from implementation of the project would be less than significant.

MITIGATION MONITORING OR REPORTING PROGRAM DRYDEN COURT SINGLE FAMILY HOME				
Impact	**Mitigation**	**Timeframe for Implementation**	**Responsibility for Implementation**	**Oversight of Implementation**
GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
Geo-1 Impact: New construction on the subject site which has slopes between 20 and over 30% could be susceptible to strong ground shaking or unstable soils created by planned cuts and fills in the existing steeply sloped site. **(Potentially Significant Impact)**	**Mitigation Measure GEO-1:** The project could result in impacts related to Geology and Soils in that new construction on the site with slopes ranging from 20 to over 30% could be susceptible to strong ground shaking or unstable soils created by planned cuts and fills. Impacts can be mitigated to a level of less than significant if construction level drawings include new foundation supports to extend to reach hard bedrock and all additional applicable Geotechnical Engineer recommendations set forth in the Summit Engineering report dated February 2016. Building permit plan submittal shall be accompanied by a design level report prepared by a licensed civil engineer that includes the following: • Review of the foundation, grading and drainage plans; • Inspection of excavation operations, and particularly those for drilled pier foundations, placement of fill and backfill materials and installation of surface drains and sub-drains behind retaining walls; and, • Preparation and submittal of a Final Soil's Engineer Report prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the structure that indicates whether construction was done according to expected soils characteristics, or new features were encountered which required special engineering conditions.	All recommendations shall be included on grading permit application submittal and construction level drawings. All recommendations shall be verified and approved by appropriate City Division prior to issuance of grading and building permits for the proposed development.	Project Applicant	Public Works – Engineering; Development Services Department – Planning Division and Building Division.

SOURCE: City of Hayward, **Dryden Court Single Family Home Initial Study, August 2016**