



## **8.0 Effects Found Not To Be Significant**





## 8.0 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

CEQA provides that an EIR shall focus on the significant effects on the environment and discuss potential environmental effects with emphasis in proportion to their severity and probability of occurrence. During preparation of this EIR, the City conducted an analysis of the Project's effect on specific environmental topic areas, included as part of the Environmental Checklist form presented in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G. Through the course of this evaluation, certain impacts were identified as "less than significant" or "no impact" due to the inability of a Project of this scope and nature to yield such impacts or the absence of Project characteristics producing effects of this type. These effects are not required to be included in the EIR's primary environmental analysis sections (Section 5.1 through 5.12). In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15128, the following discussion includes a brief description of potential impacts found to be less than significant or that would have no impact. The lettered analyses under each topical area directly correspond to their order in CEQA Guidelines Appendix G.

### **AESTHETICS.** *Would the project:*

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

**No Impact.** Neither the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) nor the County of Los Angeles identify any designated scenic highways within the City or in its immediate vicinity. However, Azusa Avenue (State Highway 39), to the north of I-210, is eligible to become a State scenic highway, but has not yet been officially designated.<sup>1</sup> Due to the distance of this segment of State Highway 39 (approximately 1.0 mile east of the Site) and intervening structures and vegetation, the Site is not located in the viewshed of this eligible State scenic highway. No impacts would occur in this regard.

### **AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES.** *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?*

**No Impact.** As described in Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the Site is currently developed with golf holes 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Azusa Greens Country Club. No farmland uses occur on-site. Further, according to the California Department of Conservation, the Site is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.<sup>2</sup> Thus, Project development would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses and no impact would occur.

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Transportation, *California Scenic Highway Mapping System*, [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic\\_highways/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/), accessed on August 20, 2018.

<sup>2</sup> California Department of Conservation, *Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program*, California Important Farmland Finder, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>, accessed August 17, 2018.



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

**No Impact.** Adoption of the Specific Plan would involve a Zone Change to change the Specific Plan Area's existing zoning from Recreation to Specific Plan. The City does not have any agricultural-related zoning designations, nor is the Site part of a Williamson Act contract.<sup>3</sup> In addition, the land uses surrounding the Site are not zoned for agricultural uses or in a Williamson Act contract. Thus, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and no impact would occur.

- 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))?*

**No Impact.** According to the City's Zoning Map, the City does not have a zoning district for forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production. As discussed, the Site is currently zoned Recreation, which is not a forest land, timberland, or Timberland Production zoning designation. Thus, Project implementation would not result in the rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production and no impact would occur.

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

**No Impact.** Refer to Agricultural and Forestry Resources Response (c). The Site does not support forestry resources and is currently developed as a golf course. Thus, Project implementation would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use and no impact would occur.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** Refer to Agricultural Resources and Forestry Responses (a) through (c). Project implementation would not result in the conversion of designated farmland or forest land to non-agricultural/non-forest land use, and no impact would occur.

**AIR QUALITY. Would the project:**

- e) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Construction activity associated with the Project may generate detectable odors from heavy-duty equipment exhaust. However, established requirements addressing construction equipment operations, and construction material use, storage, and disposal requirements act to minimize odor impacts that may result from construction activities. Moreover, construction-source odor emissions would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature and would not result in persistent impacts that would affect substantial numbers of people. Potential construction-source odor impacts are therefore considered less than significant.

---

<sup>3</sup> California Department of Conservation, *Los Angeles County Williamson Act FY 2015/2016*, [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA\\_15\\_16\\_WA.pdf](http://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/LA_15_16_WA.pdf), accessed August 17, 2018.



Substantial odor-generating sources include land uses such as agricultural activities, feedlots, wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, food processing plants, chemical plants, refineries, or other heavy industrial uses. The Project does not propose any such uses or activities that would result in potentially significant operational-source odor impacts. Potential sources of operational odors generated by the Project would predominantly be limited to the disposal of miscellaneous refuse. Moreover, South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) Rule 402 acts to prevent occurrences of odor nuisances. Consistent with City requirements, all Project generated refuse would be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with solid waste regulations. As such, operational-source odor impacts are considered less than significant.

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. *Would the project:***

- b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services?*

**No Impact.** The Site and immediate surrounding areas are developed with light industrial, recreation, and residential uses. Given the longstanding use of the Site as the Azusa Greens Country Club, there are no riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities on-site. The closest riparian habitat is located approximately 0.4-mile to the west of the Site along the San Gabriel River. Development of the Project would occur within the Site boundary and thus, would have no impacts to the San Gabriel River and its associated riparian habitat.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The *Biological Technical Report for the California Grand Village Project* (Biological Technical Report), did not identify any drainage or wetland features within the Site that would be considered jurisdictional by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW); refer to Appendix 11.3, *Biological Technical Report*. No water features are currently present on the Site and the Site does not include any jurisdictional drainages or wetland features that could be considered jurisdictional. Thus, no regulatory approvals from the USACE, RWQCB, or CDFW would be required and no impacts would occur in this regard.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The Site and surrounding vicinity are not located within an area covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved conservation plan.<sup>4,5</sup> No impact would occur in this regard.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office, *HCP/NCCP Planning Areas*, January 28, 2015, [https://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/HCPs/documents/hcp\\_inrmp\\_20150127.pdf](https://www.fws.gov/carlsbad/HCPs/documents/hcp_inrmp_20150127.pdf), accessed August 2, 2018.

<sup>5</sup> California Department of Fish and Wildlife, *California Regional Conservation Plans*, October 2017, <https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=68626&inline>, accessed August 2, 2018.



**GEOLOGY AND SOILS.** *Would the project:*

- h) *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?*

**No Impact.** No septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems are currently located within the Site and none would be constructed as part of the Project. Thus, no impacts would occur in this regard.

**HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.** *Would the project:*

- 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?*

**No Impact.** Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) and State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) to compile and update a regulatory sites listing (per the criteria of the Section). The California Department of Health Services is also required to compile and update, as appropriate, a list of all public drinking water wells that contain detectable levels of organic contaminants and that are subject to water analysis pursuant to Section 116395 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 65962.5 requires the local enforcement agency, as designated pursuant to Section 18051 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, to compile, as appropriate, a list of all solid waste disposal facilities from which there is a known migration of hazardous waste. The Project site is not listed pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.<sup>6</sup> Thus, no impact would result in this regard.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The nearest airport is the El Monte Airport, located approximately seven miles southwest of the Site. The Site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of an airport. Furthermore, construction and operation of the Project would not result in airport-related safety hazards for people residing or working in the area. Therefore, no impacts would result in this regard.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The Site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Project construction and operation would not result in airstrip-related safety hazards for people residing or working in the area. Therefore, no impacts would result in this regard.

---

<sup>6</sup> California Environmental Protection Agency, *Cortese Listing*, <https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/>, accessed on September 11, 2018.



- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Site is located in an area surrounded by a built urban environment. Based on General Plan EIR Figure 4.7-2, *Fire Hazard Areas*, the Site is located within a “low risk” fire risk zone. The Project would not subject people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of exposure to wildland fires. Therefore, no impact would result.

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. *Would the project:***

- 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?*

**No Impact.** As indicated in Section 5.6, the Federal Emergency Management Act (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map 06037C1420F indicates that the Site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area.<sup>7</sup> Thus, the Project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area and no impacts would occur in this regard.

- h) *Place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area that would impede or redirect flood flows?*

**No Impact.** As indicated in Hydrology and Water Quality Response (g), the Site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area. Thus, the Project would not place a structure within a 100-year flood hazard area and no impacts would occur in this regard.

- j) *Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

**No Impact.** Seiches are large waves generated in enclosed bodies of water in response to ground shaking. The Site is not located within a coastal area, and no water bodies are on or adjacent to the Site that would impact the Project due to seiche. The nearest water body to the Site is the San Gabriel River situated approximately 0.4-mile to the west; however, the Site is at an elevation approximately eleven feet higher than the river. The nearest coastal area is the Pacific Ocean, located approximately 35 miles west of the Site. As a result, tsunamis (seismic sea waves) and seiches are not considered a significant hazard at the Site. No impacts from seiche events are anticipated. In addition, given the developed nature of the area, there are no adjacent features capable of inundating the Site by mudflow. Thus, Project implementation is not anticipated to result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow. No impact would occur.

**LAND USE AND PLANNING. *Would the project:***

- a) *Physically divide an established community?*

**No Impact.** The 19.36-acre Site encompasses existing golf holes 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Azusa Greens Country Club. Surrounding land uses include a mixture of light industrial, recreation, and residential. There are no established communities in the Site vicinity. Redevelopment of the northern portion of the Site with an independent senior living community would not

---

<sup>7</sup> Federal Emergency Management Agency, *Flood Insurance Rate Map 06037C1420F*, effective date September 26, 2008.





physically divide an established community. Existing single-family residences (Rancho Azusa) to the north of West Sierra Madre Avenue would remain intact and surrounded by the northern portion of the Azusa Greens Country Club. The Azusa Greens Country Club currently separates light industrial uses (Colorama Wholesale Nursery) west of North Todd Avenue and south of 10th Street from light industrial (Rain Bird Corporation) and multi-family residential uses (Le Med Apartment Homes) situated south of West Sierra Madre Avenue. Realignment of golf holes 3, 4, 5, and 6 on the southern portion of the Site would allow the Azusa Greens Country Club to retain its 18-hole, PAR 70, golf course and continue to separate uses west of Todd Avenue and south of 10th Street. No impacts would occur in this regard.

- c) *Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?*

**No Impact.** As discussed in Biological Resources Response (f), the Site and surrounding vicinity are not located within an area covered by a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved conservation plan. No impact would occur in this regard.

**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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Based on the California Geological Survey, much of the City is designated as Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2), which is defined as areas where geologic data indicate that significant mineral resources are present.<sup>8</sup> However, more specifically, the Site is not designated as a mineral resource zone under General Plan Figure MR-1, *Mineral Resource Zones in Azusa*. Further, the Site has been developed as a golf course since 1988 and no mining activities currently occur on-site. Thus, development of the Project would not result in the displacement of any existing mining operations and would not represent a loss of availability of any known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and residents of the State. As such, less than significant impacts would occur in this regard.

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to the Mineral Resources Response (a). A less than significant impact would occur in this regard.

**NOISE. *Would the project:***

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The Site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public airport or public-use airport. The closest airport is the El Monte Airport and is located

---

<sup>8</sup> California Geological Survey, *San Gabriel Valley P-C Region Showing MRZ-2 Areas and Active Mining Operations*, 2010, [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR\\_209/Plate%201.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_209/Plate%201.pdf), accessed August 17, 2018.





approximately seven miles southwest of the Site. Given the distance, no impacts would occur in this regard.

- 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?*

**No Impact.** The Site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the Project would not expose people to excessive noise levels associated with the operation of a private airstrip. No impact would occur in this regard.

**POPULATION AND HOUSING. *Would the project:***

- a) *Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Development of the Senior Village would induce direct population growth in the City by introducing 253 dwelling units and employing staff to run the Senior Village. Specifically, the Project would introduce 303 residents and 90 employees. As concluded in Section 6.3, *Growth-Inducing Impacts*, the Project would not foster significant unanticipated population growth in the Site vicinity and would only nominally increase the forecasted population growth and housing stock anticipated by the General Plan (an increase of 4.7 percent and 12.7 percent, respectively) and Southern California Association of Governments' 2016 *Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategies* (an increase of 9.9 percent and 16.6 percent, respective); refer to Section 6.3. As such, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

- b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact.** No existing housing is present on-site. Thus, Project implementation would not result in the displacement of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. No impact would result in this regard.

- c) *Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

**No Impact.** Refer to Public Services Response (d). The Project is located at the Azusa Greens Country Club, a private golf course, and would not impact displace people.

**PUBLIC SERVICES. *Would the project:***

- (a)(3) *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 schools?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project does not involve construction of any new or physically altered school facilities. Further, the Site is not situated in the vicinity of school facilities and thus would not disrupt school services. Construction-related impacts would be less than significant in this regard.



The Specific Plan would develop an independent senior living community for seniors ages 62 and older. As a result, Specific Plan residents are not anticipated to substantially increase demand for Azusa Unified School District (AUSD) school services. Although there is the potential that employees of the senior living community could generate students, which would increase demand for AUSD school services, impacts to school facilities would be fully offset following payment of statutory fees as the time of development pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 50 and General Plan Public Services Policy 1.3. Additionally, Education Code Section 17620, et seq. allows school districts to collect development impact fees from developers of new residential uses. Pursuant to Government Code Section 65996, payment of statutory fees is considered full mitigation for new development projects. Thus, payment of school development impact fees would offset the cost of providing school services to the nominal quantity of new students, which could be indirectly generated by Senior Village employees. The Project would not foster unanticipated population growth in the Site vicinity capable of significantly impacting public services; refer to [Section 6.3](#). Operational impacts to school services would be less than significant in this regard.

- (a)(4) *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 parks?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** The Project is located at the Azusa Greens Country Club, a private golf course, and would not impact public park or recreational facilities. To accommodate the Senior Village, the area of the golf course just north of 10th Street would be reconfigured to accommodate four golf holes (golf holes 3, 4, 5, and 6) instead of just the two existing golf holes (golf holes 4 and 5); refer to [Exhibit 3-3, Conceptual Site Plan](#). While the overall yardage of golf play over these four holes would be slightly reduced, the PAR would remain at 70 for the overall Azusa Greens Country Club golf course. The Project would increase permanent residents in the City by 303 persons who may visit nearby parks in the Site vicinity and increase demand for park services. However, the Project would not foster substantial unanticipated population growth in the Site vicinity capable of increasing demand for or use of existing local or regional park facilities such that substantial adverse physical impacts would occur; refer to [Section 6.3](#). Additionally, the Project itself includes a number of recreational amenities and outdoor spaces that residents would be able to enjoy within the Senior Village. Planned amenities include a wine bar/outdoor patio, fitness rooms, outdoor pool and spa, outdoor deck/courtyard, day spa/wellness center facility, multi-purpose meeting and activity rooms, movie theater, and hair salon. Proposed outdoor recreational areas would include walking paths, benches, shade structures, outdoor fireplaces, gardens, a dog park, and passive landscaped areas. Further, the Project would be designed to maintain the Azusa Green Country Club's connectivity throughout the Specific Plan Area. Due to the amount and variety of open spaces provided by the Project, it is not anticipated that residents would utilize neighborhood and regional parks in the Site vicinity such that substantial physical deterioration would occur or be accelerated. For this reason, the Project would result in less than significant impacts to public park and recreational facilities.

- (a)(5) *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 other public facilities (libraries)?*



**Less Than Significant Impact.** As discussed in Section 5.12, *Public Services and Utilities*, the Azusa Public Library is currently understaffed and lacks adequate resources (e.g., modern equipment and new hardware technology) to adequately serve City residents due to budgetary constraints. The majority of funding for library services is provided through the City's General Fund; however, the library periodically receives funding sources from grant awards.<sup>9</sup> The Project would introduce 303 permanent residents into the City who may visit the library and increase demand for library services. However, the Project would not foster substantial unanticipated population growth in the Site vicinity capable of increasing demand for or use of existing library services such that substantial adverse physical impacts would occur; refer to Section 6.3. Additionally, tax revenue generated from the Project implementation (e.g., property and sales taxes) would increase the City's revenue and contribute to the General Fund to offset Project-related impacts to library services. Pursuant to General Plan Public Services Policy 1.3 and Resolution No. 2018-C07, the City requires development to offset impacts to public services through the collection of development impact fees.<sup>10</sup> As such, impacts would be less than significant in this regard.

**RECREATION. *Would the project:***

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Public Services (a)(4).

- 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?*

**Less Than Significant Impact.** Refer to Public Services (a)(4). The Project is located at the Azusa Greens Country Club, a private golf course, and would not involve the construction of any public recreational facilities nor generate significant additional area population that would require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities. Compliance with the relevant laws, ordinances, and regulations, as well as the specified mitigation measures identified in this EIR would ensure the Project's impacts are less than significant.

**TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. *Would the project:***

- 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 Impact.** The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) is responsible for implementing Los Angeles County's *2010 Congestion Management Program* (2010 CMP). There are no intersections defined as CMP locations in the Site vicinity.<sup>11</sup> Thus, the Site is not subject to the 2010 CMP and no impacts would occur in this regard.

<sup>9</sup> Written Correspondence: Hassen, Leila, MLIS, Library Services Manager, Azusa City Library, dated March 6, 2018.

<sup>10</sup> City of Azusa, *Resolution No. 2018-C07: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Azusa, California, Approving and Adopting a Revised Schedule of Fees and Charges for Various Municipal Activities and Services*, January 16, 2018.

<sup>11</sup> Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, *2010 Congestion Management Program*, 2010, [http://media.metro.net/docs/cmp\\_final\\_2010.pdf](http://media.metro.net/docs/cmp_final_2010.pdf), accessed August 16, 2018.



- 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?*

**No Impact.** The closest airport is the El Monte Airport, located approximately seven miles to the southwest of the Site. The projected roofs, roof decks, and architectural features of the Senior Village would involve a maximum height of 58 feet, and the proposed golf course reconfiguration would not involve the construction of structures with the capacity to directly change air traffic patterns or change the location of air traffic. Further, development of the Senior Village would not generate a population increase such that air traffic levels would substantially increase or would require relocation of an existing airport. No impacts would occur in this regard.