NOTICE OF E	XEMPTION	
P.0 Sa X	fice of Planning and Researd D. Box 3044 cramento, CA 95812-3044 unty Clerk unty of Merced 22 M Street erced, CA 95340	City of Merced 678 West 18th St. Merced, CA 95340
Project Title:	Ŷ.	Woods Estates) ERC #21-12
Project Applican	t: Surinder Kaur Virk,	Property Owner
Project Location	(Specific): South side of	Cardella Road, west of El Redondo Drive
APN: 206-010-0	10; -011; -012	
Project Location	- City: Merced	Project Location - County: Merced
Vesting Tentative	mily lots and an approxim	vide three parcels totaling approximately 19.5 acres ately 3.6-acre parcel remainder for future multi-
•	Agency Approving Proje	ct: City of Merced
Exempt Status: ((3); 15269(a)); 4); 15269(b)(c)); 1016 amber: <u>Section 15162</u> Number:
Reasons why Pro North Annexation	ject is Exempt: This p	roject site was reviewed as part of the Fahrens Cree H20011101082). The project remains consistent wit
Lead Agency: Contact Person:	City of Merced Francisco Mendoza-C	Sonzales Area Code/Telephone:(209) 385-6858

Signature: Meln francisce Date: 5-19-22 Title: Associate Planner

Mendoga - Gonzalez

X Signed by Lead Agency Date Received for Filing at OPR:

(If applicable)

Authority Cited: Sections 21083 and 21110. Public Resources Code Reference: Sections 21108, 21152, and 21152.1. Public Resources Code

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15162 Findings:

Application: Tentative Subdivision Map #1316 – Conditions Use Permit #1264 – Environmental Review#22-12

Assessor Parcel Number or Location: Assessor's Parcel Number (APN): 206-010-010, 206-010-011, and 206-010-012

Previous Initial Study/EIR Reference: This site was previously reviewed through SCH #20011101082, Initial Study #01-32 for Fahrnes Creek North Annexation. The current proposal to construct a single-family home subdivision (113 units) is consistent with the previous environmental review and the project remains in conformancewith the City's *Merced Vision 2030 General Plan*.

Original Project Date: Initial Study #01-32, resulting in a Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopted by the Merced City Council on December 2, 2002.

Section A - Previous Studies

1. Substantial changes are proposed in the project that will require major revisions of the previous project EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects?

Yes 1	No
	X

Comment/Finding: The density proposed for the subdivision is consistent with the previous environmental review. This site was identified in the previous environmental review as high density residential allowing between 7 and 30 dwelling units per acre. The proposed subdivision of this density (approximately 10 dwelling units per acre) is considered consistent with the Village Residential density, thus, the project remains consistent with the previous environmental review.

2. Substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects?

Yes	No
	X

Comment/Finding: There have been no changes in the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that would require major revisions in the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration. There are no new significant environmental effects or substantial increases in the severity of previously identified environmental effects, and the area under consideration remains the same area previously evaluated.

3. New information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been know with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, has been revealed? (If "Yes" is checked, go to Section "B" below)

Yes]	No
	X

Comment/Finding: There is no new information of substantial importance that was not known and could not have been known with the reasonable diligence at the time the previous Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted.

		Section B - New Information		
	A)The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration.		Yes	No X
•	lignificant effect han shown in the	ts previously examined will be substantially more severe previous EIR.	Yes	No X
C)Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.			Yes	No X
th si	ose analyzed in gnificant effects	tres or alternatives which are considerably different from the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more on the environment, but the project proponents decline to on measure or alternative.	Yes N	X X
Comn	_ i	All previously identified mitigation measures will be enfincluding payment of Public Facility Impact Fees. Therefore, no greater than those previously analyzed and the previous measures remain sufficient to address all impacts from this previous that the previous remain sufficient to address all impacts from the previous remains	the resulti sly impos	ng impacts are
	e basis of this e of the CEQA (valuation, in accordance with the requirements of Section Guidelines:	1	
	1. It is found that	subsequent negative declaration will need to be prepared.		
	2. It is found that a	an addendum Negative Declaration will need to be prepared.		
	3 That a subseque	ent EIR will need to be prepared		

Date: May 19, 2022 Prepared By:

4. No further documentation is required.

Francisco Mendoza-Gonzalez,

Associate Planner