

## CITY OF ROLLING HILLS ESTATES INITIAL STUDY, ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. **Project Title:** Peninsula Village Overlay Zone
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Rolling Hills Estates
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Niki Cutler, Senior Planner  
310-377-1577
4. **Project Location:** The project site is generally bounded by Dry Bank Drive on the west, Indian Peak Road to the south, Crenshaw Boulevard to the east, and the City corporate boundary to the north (see Figure 1)
5. **Project Sponsor's Name/Address:** City of Rolling Hills Estates  
Planning Department  
4045 Palos Verdes Drive North  
Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274
6. **General Plan Designation:** Planning Area 6: Commercial-General Mixed Use
7. **Zoning:** Commercial-General/Mixed Use Overlay Zone
8. **Description of Project:**

See NOP text.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** The surrounding area is principally developed as residential to the north, south, east, and west. However, Palos Verdes Peninsula High School is also located to the northeast of the project site.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**

Other Agencies That May Use the Environmental Document For Discretionary Actions	
Agency	Action Required
None	None

11. **References:**

The documents listed below are incorporated into this document by reference and are available for review in the Planning Department of the City of Rolling Hills Estates, which is located in City Hall, 4045 Palos Verdes Drive North, Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274.

- a. City of Rolling Hills Estates, *General Plan*, 1992.
- b. City of Rolling Hills Estates, *Final Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Rolling Hills Estates General Plan Update*, September 1992.

12. **Appendices:** None.

## **REPORT PREPARERS**

The following consulting firms assisted the City of Rolling Hills Estates in the preparation of this Initial Study:

LSA Associates, Inc  
20 Executive Park, Suite 200  
Irvine, CA 92614  
(949) 553-0666

DKS Associates  
2222 Martin, Suite 150  
Irvine, CA 92612  
(949) 863-0041

# INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality              |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 address 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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

David Wabba  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
City of Rolling Hills Estates

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers, except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factor as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis.)
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including offsite as well as onsite, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should formally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST:**

<b>I</b> <b><u>LAND USE AND PLANNING</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Propose a use not currently permitted by the General Plan Use Map.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Propose a use not currently permitted by the Zoning Ordinance and Zoning Map.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in an increase in density beyond that permitted in the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Have an architectural style or use building materials that are substantially inconsistent with neighborhood compatibility requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Propose a use, which is incompatible with surrounding land uses because of the difference in the physical scale of development, noise levels, light and glare and traffic levels or hours operation.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Detract substantially from the rural character, as define in the Rolling Hills Estates General Plan of the City.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Conflict with any applicable Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

- I (a).      **No Impact.** The project study area is in an established commercial core and the proposed uses will integrate rather than divide this existing community (see Figure 2).
  
- I (b).      **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project is located within Planning Area 6 as identified in the Land Use Element of the General Plan. Approval of the proposed project would increase the allowable residential density, and therefore the proposed project is inconsistent with the existing General Plan designation and the Mixed Use Overlay Zone. The EIR will assess the differences in allowable residential development between the existing General Plan and zoning and the proposed General Plan Amendments and Zone Change.
  
- I (c).      **No Impact.** The project area is currently designated as Commercial General by the Land Use Element of the General Plan. The project area is also located within the Mixed-Use Overlay designation. This Mixed-Use Overlay designation permits residential uses (22 du/ac) to be located above or adjacent to commercial retail and offices. The proposed project does not introduce a land use that is not currently permitted by the General Plan designation. The proposed project will remove the Mixed-Use Overlay designation from a portion of the project area (Hawthorne Boulevard to Dry Bank) and increase the allowable residential density within the remaining portion (Dry Bank Drive to Crenshaw Boulevard) of the designation to a maximum range between 35 du/ac and 40 du/ac. The Mixed Use Overlay designation would remain.
  
- I (d).      **No Impact.** The proposed project is currently within the existing Mixed-Use Overlay Zone, which permits 22 du/ac. The proposed project will remove the Mixed-Use Overlay Zone from the project area, and residential will not be permitted in the Commercial General designated area northwest of Dry Bank Drive. The proposed Peninsula Village Overlay Zone will allow a maximum range of between

35 and 40 du/ac in the area southeast of Dry Bank Drive. Therefore, the proposed project would not introduce a new land use that is not permitted by the existing zoning.

- I (e). **Potentially Significant Impact.** As described in response I (c) above, the proposed project would allow for an increase from 22 du/ac to a maximum range of between 35–40 du/ac within the proposed Overlay Zone. Consistency of the proposed increased density with existing General Plan and Zoning policies will be assessed in the EIR.
- I (f). **Less Than Significant Impact.** The existing project area has a mix of architectural styles that would continue to be allowed with the proposed Peninsula Village Overlay Zone. Proposed Design Guidelines for the Peninsula Village Overlay Zone will be described, and their effect on the architectural character on the project area will be assessed in the EIR.
- I (g). **Potentially Significant Impact.** With the increase in residential density and the increase in building height (from a minimum of 44 feet to a maximum of 54 feet in District 3, Subarea B), there is the potential for development of existing land uses at a scale that may be incompatible with adjacent uses or result in adverse environmental effects. Compatibility with existing land uses within and adjacent to the study area will be assessed in the EIR.
- I (h). **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed increase in density and height would have the potential to introduce a more urbanized commercial core than currently exists, which could affect the rural quality of the City. With implementation of the proposed Design Guidelines, potential effects to the rural character would be minimized. The EIR will identify the proposed project’s consistency with applicable General Plan policies related to maintaining rural character within the City.
- I (i). **No Impact.** The General Plan Land Use element does not indicate any habitat conservation plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans within the City. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or Natural Community Conservation Plans.

<b>II</b> <b><u>RECREATION &amp; OPEN SPACE</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a)      Result in the loss of any City designated areas for hiking or horse or bicycle riding.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)      Reduce the ratio of parkland in the City to below 6.7 acres per 1,000 residents as designated in the General Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)      Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the open space would occur or be accelerated.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)      Individually or cumulatively considered result in a loss of any (i) existing parkland, (ii) open space, as defined by the Rolling Hills Estates General Plan, (iii) private or public recreational facilities as defined by the Rolling Hills Estates General Plan for recreational purposes and/or (iv) the replacement of privately owned public recreational facility as defined by the General Plan with non-recreational facilities as defined in the General Plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

- II (a).      **No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within a Horse Overlay Zone or in a City-designated hiking, biking, or equestrian trail according to the General Plan Open Space and Recreation Element.
  
- II (b).      **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would not remove any existing parkland. However, the proposed project may increase population in the City, which could affect the ratio of parkland to residents within the City. With the reduction in dwelling units and commercial development, demand for recreational resources would also be reduced. According to the Open Space and Recreation Element of the General Plan, the current ratio of parkland to City residents must be maintained or increased and not be less than the current ration of 6.7 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. The EIR will address potential impacts on provision of recreational resources.
  
- II (c).      **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would increase the residential population within the City of Rolling Hills Estates, increasing demand for recreational resources. The EIR would evaluate potential impacts to parks or other recreational facilities in the City.
  
- II (d).      **Less Than Significant Impact.** The project area does not include any public or private parkland, open space, or recreational facilities. However, according to the Equestrian Trails Map (Exhibit 6-1) in the General Plan, Crenshaw Boulevard, southwesterly of Silver Spur Road, is designated a proposed trail. The EIR would evaluate potential impacts to implementation of future equestrian trails or other recreational facilities in the City.

<b>III     <u>AESTHETICS</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Not meet the Rolling Hills Estates development standards or neighborhood compatibility standards in a substantial manner.	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect (i.e. development standards, design guidelines, etc).	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Include new electrical service box and utilities lines above ground.	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Be located within a view corridor and include unscreened outdoor uses or equipment inconsistent with the rural character, as define by the City of Rolling Hills Estates General Plan.	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Result in the loss of any (i) Environmentally Sensitive Area as defined by the City of Rolling Hills Estates, (ii) natural undeveloped canyon or (iii) hillside area.	☒	☐	☐	☐
f) Obstruct the public's view of (i) scenic resources or (ii) a scenic corridor or (iii) vista as identified (on a case-by-case basis).	☒	☐	☐	☐
g) Contrast with the surrounding development and/or scenic resources due to the project's height, mass, bulk, grading, signs, setback, color or landscape.	☒	☐	☐	☐
h) Be located along a City designated scenic or view corridor and contrast with the surrounding development and/or scenic resources due to the project's height, mass, bulk, grading, signs, setback, color or landscape.	☒	☐	☐	☐
i) Substantially: (i) remove natural features, or (ii) add man-made features, or (iii) structures which degrade the visual intactness and unity of the scenic corridor or vista.	☒	☐	☐	☐
j) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area that will exceed the standards established in the Municipal Code, illuminate areas outside the project boundary, and uses excessive reflective building material.	☐	☒	☐	☐
k) Include roadway improvements will result in a substantial decrease of open space or trees.	☐	☐	☐	☒
l) Include roadway improvements that are not consistent with the surrounding landscape.	☐	☐	☐	☒
m) Result in the installation of a traffic signal that is not justified by signal warrants or documented roadway hazards.	☐	☐	☐	☒
n) Result in the installation of a traffic signal in a residential neighborhood. <sup>1</sup>	☐	☐	☐	☒

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

III (a).     **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would increase the allowed residential density within a portion of the existing commercial core. The proposed Overlay Zone and associated Design Guidelines will be described and their relationship to existing design standards described in the EIR. The EIR will analyze visual impacts of the proposed Peninsula Village Overlay Zone and Design Guidelines.

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this traffic signal threshold only, a signal is considered to be located in residential neighborhood if it is within or abutting a residentially zoned property.

- III (b). **Potentially Significant Impact.** As stated in III (a), the proposed project would increase the allowed residential density within the existing commercial core. Development envisioned in the proposed overlay zone may conflict with an existing General Plan and zoning regulation related to avoidance or mitigation of environmental effects. The EIR will assess potential inconsistencies between the proposed Peninsula Village Overlay Zone and existing plans, policies, and regulations.
- III (c). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could require additional aboveground utilities in the project area, which may have a visual impact. The EIR will analyze potential visual impacts of the types of utilities within the proposed Peninsula Village Overlay Zone.
- III (d). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Silver Spur Road between Hawthorne Boulevard and Crenshaw Boulevard, Hawthorne Boulevard between Indian Peak Road and Blackhorse Road, and Crenshaw Boulevard between Indian Peak Road and the City boundary to the north of Silver Spur Road are all designated Scenic Corridors in the Scenic Highways Overlay Zone (Exhibit 5-2) of the Conservation Element in the General Plan. The proposed project boundaries include portions of Hawthorne Boulevard, Silverspur Road, and Crenshaw Boulevard that are within the designated Scenic Highway Overlay Zone. The Conservation Element of the General Plan outlines specific guidelines addressing development along these corridors. The EIR will analyze potential visual impacts of the proposed Peninsula Village Overlay Zone to designated scenic corridors.
- III (e). **Potentially Significant Impact.** North of Crenshaw Boulevard (between Indian Peak Road and Silver Spur Road) is designated in the Ecological Resource Overlay Zone (Exhibit 5-1) as an area where sensitive habitats are located. The EIR will analyze potential visual impacts of the proposed Peninsula Village Overlay Zone related to the Environmentally Sensitive Area and existing hillside area.
- III (f). **Potentially Significant Impact.** As previously stated, the project area is within the Scenic Corridor Overlay Zone, according to the Conservation Element of the General Plan. Increased residential density may affect public views of existing scenic resources, vistas, or scenic corridors. The EIR will analyze visual impacts of the proposed Peninsula Village Overlay Zone on public views.
- III (g). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would allow for increased residential development with the existing commercial core, which may alter the existing visual character within the project study area. The EIR will analyze visual impacts of the proposed project.
- III (h). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response III (f and g) above.
- III (i). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Increased residential density may affect public views of existing scenic resources, vistas, or scenic corridors. Potential impacts to scenic corridors and vistas will be addressed in the EIR.
- III (j). **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated.** The proposed project increases residential development density in the project area. This intensification of residential uses in the project area could introduce new sources of light and glare, affecting day and nighttime views in the area. The EIR will analyze lighting and glare impacts of the proposed project.
- III (k). **No Impact.** No new roadways are planned as part of the proposed project. A Traffic Study will be prepared in concurrence with the EIR, which will analyze the potential necessity for roadway improvements and additional traffic signals. The EIR will analyze potential effects of any roadway modifications on open space, trees, and the surrounding community.
- III (l). **No Impact.** Please refer to Response III (k) above.
- III (m). **No Impact.** Please refer to Response III (k) above.
- III (n). **No Impact.** Please refer to Response III (k) above.

IV <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Itself, or when cumulatively considered result in a traffic impact. A change in Level of Service (LOS) from C to D or D to E is a traffic impact. Within LOS C or D, a change in ICU value greater than 0.02 is an impact and within LOS E or F a change in ICU greater than 0.01 is an impact. For unsignalized intersections, an impact occurs when the addition of project traffic increases the Level of Service to an unacceptable level (less than LOS C).	☒	☐	☐	☐
b) Trigger one or more signal warrants.	☒	☐	☐	☐
c) Include design features, uses, or traffic volumes that may cause traffic hazards such as sharp curves, tight turning radii from streets, limited roadway visibility, short merging lanes, uneven road grades, pedestrian, bicycle or equestrian safety concerns, or any other conditions determined by the City Traffic Engineer to be a hazard.	☒	☐	☐	☐
d) Result in additional access points on arterial streets as defined by the General Plan.	☒	☐	☐	☐
e) Result in a residential project that will result in a secondary access point.	☒	☐	☐	☐
f) Create one or more access points on a roadway that is not the primary frontage.	☒	☐	☐	☐
g) Create a flag lot <sup>1</sup> adjacent to an arterial street, as defined by the General Plan.	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Result in inadequate parking capacity as determined by the City in evaluating the reasonably foreseeable demands of the specific project.	☒	☐	☐	☐
i) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks).	☐	☐	☐	☒

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

IV (a). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The residential development proposed could have an effect on traffic volumes and patterns within the project area. As the proposed project would result in less development than currently envisioned in the General Plan and Zoning Code, potential future traffic volumes are expected to be less than projected. The EIR will include the preparation of a detailed traffic study, including the analysis of traffic impacts at local intersections and roadway segments, access to the project site, and parking.

IV (b). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could trigger one or more signal warrants in the project area. As stated in Response IV (a), The EIR will include the preparation of a detailed traffic study, including the analysis of traffic impacts at local intersections and roadway segments, access to the project site, and parking.

<sup>1</sup> A flag lot is defined as a lot located behind another lot that has normal street frontage. A flag lot includes a strip of land that goes out to the street and is generally used for an access drive. There are two distinct parts to a flag lot; the flag, which comprises the actual building site, located behind another lot, and the pole, which provides access from the street to the flag. A flag lot results from the division of a large lot with the required area and depth for two lots, but which has insufficient width to locate both lots on the street frontage.

- IV (c). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could have an impact on vehicular movement within the project area. The EIR will include the preparation of a detailed traffic study, which includes evaluation of potential traffic hazards from project design or trip generation. Appropriate mitigation measures would be identified.
- IV (d). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project could introduce new access points or reconfiguration of existing driveways. Potential effects of additional or reconfigured access points will be assessed in the EIR.
- IV (e). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response IV (d) above.
- IV (f). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response IV (d) above.
- IV (g). **No Impact.** There are no changes to the existing lot configuration with approval of the proposed project. Any subsequent subdivisions of land that generate flag lots would be processed separately by the City.
- IV (h). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Increased residential development associated with the proposed Overlay Zone may result in impacts on parking supply in the commercial core. The proposed Peninsula Village Overlay Zone will allow high-density mixed-use residential development in an existing commercial area. The EIR will include the preparation of a parking analysis that will identify existing parking, potential changes in parking demand, and appropriate mitigation measures.
- IV (i). **No Impact.** The proposed Overlay Zone will not conflict with existing program plans or policies related to alternative modes of transportation (e.g., bus turnouts and bicycle racks). By providing residences within the commercial core and creating a pedestrian friendly district, vehicle trips within the district could potentially be reduced.

V <u>AIR QUALITY</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relief upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i>				
a) Fail to meet the applicable State and Federal air quality plan (i) because the project may cause or contribute to emission of identified air pollutants in excess of levels stated in the plan or (ii) where it may fail to implement a remedial or mitigation measure required under the appropriate plan.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Results in emission of identified pollutants in excess of the pounds per day or tons per quarter standards established by SCAQMD.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Cause a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality regulations (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors) where the incremental effect of the project emissions, considered together with past, present, and reasonably anticipated future project emissions, increase the level of any criteria pollutant above the existing ambient levels.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people because the project may cause an odiferous emission, including emissions resulting from vehicles, that is noxious, putrid, having an appreciable chemical smell, or having an appreciable smell of human or animal waste, rendering, or by-products.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

- V (a). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would result in emissions of air contaminants. Given that the proposed project results in less development than currently envisioned in the General Plan and Zoning Code, air pollutant emissions are expected to be less than currently predicted. The EIR will include a quantitative analysis and a detailed evaluation of air quality impacts, including an assessment of potential violations of any air quality standards and the difference in emissions level between approved land uses within the commercial core and the proposed uses within the proposed overlay zone.
- V (b). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response V (a) above.
- V (c). **Less Than Significant Impact.** The increase in residential density associated with the proposed project would be less than currently projected, would result in an improvement to cumulative air quality conditions, and potentially result in significant air quality impacts that could be cumulatively considerable. Given that the proposed project results in less development than currently envisioned in the General Plan and Zoning Code, air pollutant emissions are expected to be less than currently predicted.
- V (d). **No Impact.** The increase in residential density within the proposed project would not introduce additional land uses that would create objectionable odors greater than existing conditions. Residential land uses generate odors typical of other urban uses generally related to trash disposal.

VI <u>NOISE</u>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project result in:</i>				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of code requirements (Chapter 8.32).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

VI (a). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Increased noise levels may result from additional vehicle trips associated with implementation of the existing General Plan and Zoning and the proposed Overlay Zone. A technical noise study will be conducted that describes existing noise conditions and predicted noise levels with and without implementation of the proposed project.

<b>VII <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Be a project, other than a minor lot improvement undertaken by an individual homeowner, and be located in a high ecological sensitivity area as defined by the General Plan and not preserve ecological habitat that is found at the project site in accordance with the guidelines established by the General Plan Conservation Element.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with General Plan policies for protecting biological resources.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in the loss of any (i) Environmentally Sensitive Area as defined by the City of Rolling Hills Estates, (ii) natural undeveloped canyon or (iii) hillside area.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) 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 Game, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Have a substantial adverse effect on 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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Interfere substantially with (i) the movement of any native resident or (ii) migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or (iii) impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Have biological resource impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

- VII (a). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The southern portion of the proposed project area (north of Crenshaw Boulevard) is located within an Ecological Overlay Zone as designated on Exhibit 5-1 of the Conservation Element of the General Plan. The EIR will identify existing biological resources on site and potential impacts due to development within the proposed Overlay Zone.
- VII (b). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response VII (a) above.
- VII (c). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The southern portion of the proposed project area, north of Crenshaw Boulevard, consists of open slopes and is located within the Ecological Overlay Zone. The EIR will identify existing biological resources on site and potential impacts due to development within the proposed Overlay Zone.
- VII (d). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The southern portion of the proposed project area, north of Crenshaw Boulevard, consists of open slopes and is located within the Ecological Overlay Zone. The EIR will

verify the existence of any sensitive species as part of a field reconnaissance and identify any potentially significant impacts due to development within the proposed Overlay Zone.

- VII (e). **Potentially Significant Impact.** According to the USGS *Torrance* quadrangle map, there are no drainages or other water resources located on site. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to affect riparian habitat. The EIR will verify the existence of any riparian habitat as part of a field reconnaissance and identify any potentially significant impacts due to development within the proposed Overlay Zone. Please see Response VII(d) above, regarding sensitive communities.
- VII (f). **Potentially Significant Impact.** According to the USGS *Torrance* quadrangle map, there are no drainages or water resources located on site. Therefore, the proposed project is not expected to affect wetlands and the EIR will verify the existence of any wetlands as part of a field reconnaissance and identify any potentially significant impacts due to development within the proposed Overlay Zone.
- VII (g). **Less Than Significant Impact.** There are vacant undeveloped parcels located within the existing commercial core that can serve as wildlife movement corridors or contain wildlife nursery sites. Varieties of common wildlife species are present within the City and may utilize the site for foraging or nesting. Biological reconnaissance surveys will be conducted as part of the EIR to determine the potential for sensitive habitat and/or species that may be affected by the proposed project.
- VII (h). **No Impact.** There is a vacant property on the slope adjacent to Indian Peak Road with limited vegetation. It is not expected that development within these parcels would degrade the habitat of native plants or animals. Biological reconnaissance surveys will be conducted as part of the EIR to determine the potential for sensitive habitat and/or species that may be affected by the proposed project.
- VII (i). **No Impact.** Due to the limited extent of undeveloped parcels within the commercial core, it is not expected that vegetation disturbed by future development within the district would result in a considerable contribution to cumulative biological impacts. Biological reconnaissance surveys will be conducted as part of the EIR to determine the potential for sensitive habitat and/or species that may be affected by the proposed project.

<b>VIII <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Be located in high cultural sensitivity area as defined by the Rolling Hills Estates General Plan and will result in grading in excess of 20 cubic yards of soil.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or archeological resource as defined in § 15064.5 of the California Code of Regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

- VIII (a). **No Impact.** The proposed project is designated as Low Sensitivity in Exhibit 5-3 of the Conservation Element Cultural Resource Overlay Zone. There are no known prehistoric or historic structures or objects within the project area.
- VIII (b). **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is located in an urbanized area of the City of Rolling Hills Estates. There is the potential to encounter unknown archaeological and historical resources during development of the Overlay Zone. As part of the EIR, a cultural resources assessment is required to identify any unknown prehistoric or historical resources and assess potential effects.
- VIII (c). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project site is located in an urbanized area of the City. Excavation activities associated with development within the proposed Overlay Zone have the potential to encounter paleontological resources. As part of the EIR, the sensitivity of the project area for encountering paleontological resources will be established and appropriate mitigation measures identified. Any paleontological resources that may have been present prior to development would have likely been destroyed due to the previous disturbance necessary to construct the existing building located on site.
- VIII (d). **Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.** Human remains are not anticipated to be present on site. An assessment will be conducted to determine whether any known human remains (including those interred outside of formal cemeteries) exist at the project site. If human remains are potentially present, a discussion will be included in the EIR.

<b>IX</b> <b><u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a)    Involve modifications on slopes greater than 2:1.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)    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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii)    Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii)    Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv)    Landslides?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v)    Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 offsite landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d)    Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risk to life or property?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)    Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

IX (a).      **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project would allow modifications to a slope greater than 2:1, located east of Indian Peak Road and north of Crenshaw Boulevard. The EIR would analyze potentially significant impacts resulting from modifications on this slope, and mitigation measures reducing impacts may be identified.

IX (b).      **Potentially Significant Impact.** i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?* According to the Public Safety Element Seismic Hazards Map, the Cabrillo Fault traverses the project site near Silver Spur Canyon (Exhibit 8-4). The General Plan Land Use Element, Exhibit 2-12, indicates that the project area is located in the Hazards Management Overlay. Existing and future development on site may be subject to the effects of ground shaking, and fault rupture, including unstable soils. As part of the EIR, the sensitivity of the project area being subject to seismic activity will be evaluated.

**Potentially Significant Impact.** ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?* Please refer to Response IX (b) i) above.

**Potentially Significant Impact.** iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?* Please refer to Response IX (b) i) above.

**Potentially Significant Impact.** iv) *Landslides?* There has been recent landslide activity on the northerly slopes southerly within the project area, particularly north of Indian Peak Road and north of

Little Silver Spur Road. Potential effects of landslides on future development within the project area will be evaluated in the EIR.

**Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation.** v) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?* The proposed project would allow additional development to the project area. As a result, additional development may cause soil erosion during grading and construction activities. However, through the implementation of proper construction techniques and execution of a soil erosion control plan, the impacts associated with soil erosion are anticipated to be less than significant. Potential impacts on soil erosion and loss of topsoil will be further analyzed in the EIR.

IX (c). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response IX (b) iv) regarding existing landslides. The EIR will assess potential impacts associated with unstable soils such as landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.

IX (d). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Within the project area the presence of expansive soils will be assessed in the EIR, and compliance with Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code will be further analyzed. The potential structural impacts of the steep slopes at the proposed site will also be assessed for the EIR.

IX (e). **No Impact.** The project site is currently utilizing the local sewer system. Septic tanks are not necessary.

<b>X</b> <b><u>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Be located in the Hazard Management Overlay Zone.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Emit hazardous emissions or handle petroleum, or petroleum byproducts, or hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be located (i) within an area covered by an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, (ii) within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, and (iii) will result in a safety hazard for people working in the project area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

- X (a).      **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site is within the Hazards Management Overlay Zone, which indicates a Fault Caution Zone and a Fire Hazard Zone on the site. The EIR will analyze the sensitivity of the project area being subject to seismic activity and fire hazards.
- X (b).      **No Impact.** Routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials currently occurs within the project area. The proposed project would allow an increase in residential density. It is not anticipated that the introduction of residential uses would not substantially increase the use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials beyond existing conditions.
- X (c).      **No Impact.** The proposed project does not include land uses that result in activities that would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- X (d).      **No Impact.** The proposed project is within one-fourth mile of the Palos Verdes Peninsula High School. The proposed project would allow an increase in residential density. These types of land uses do not generate emissions of or require handling of petroleum or other hazardous materials. It is not anticipated that the increase in residential density would result in emissions/handling of hazardous materials beyond existing conditions. No impact is expected.
- X (e).      **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project site has the potential for the prior land uses to have contaminated the on-site soils or groundwater. As part of the EIR preparation, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will be conducted to identify properties with known sources of contamination and any

potentially significant impacts resulting from hazards. Mitigation measures would be identified to reduce the impacts.

- X (f). **No Impact.** The Torrance Municipal Airport, which is a public airport owned by the City of Torrance, is located approximately 1.5 nautical miles north of the project site. According to the City of Torrance, Community Development Department, Rolling Hills Estates is not within the Torrance Municipal Airport Land Use Plan.<sup>1</sup> Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is located approximately 12.3 nautical miles to the northwest. According to the DEIS/EIR for the Los Angeles International Airport Proposed Master Plan Improvements (January 2001), the project is not located within the airport land use plan. The project site is not located within a designated aircraft crash zone, nor will it involve any improvements that would otherwise affect airport operations. As a result, the proposed project will not present a safety hazard related to aircraft or airport operations.
- X (g). **No Impact.** The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip (Eagle Aerial, 2005).The project site is not located along a roadway designated as an emergency response route in the Public Safety Element of the General Plan. Crenshaw Boulevard is a County-designated evacuation route, and Silver Spur Road and Indian Peak Road are proposed City-designated disaster routes.
- X (h). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The project area is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip (Eagle Aerial, 2005).The project site is not located along a roadway designated as an emergency response route in the Public Safety Element of the General Plan. Crenshaw Boulevard is a County-designated evacuation route, and Silver Spur Road and Indian Peak Road are proposed City-designated disaster routes. According to the Public Safety Element, the project site currently contains four City-designated High Occupancy and Dependent Care Facilities. The proposed project would increase the allowable residential density, and the potential to affect existing emergency response plans will be evaluated in the EIR.
- X (i). **Potentially Significant Impact.** According to the Public Safety Element, the project site is identified by the Fire Hazard Management Map as an area of Moderate to High Fire Risk and as having Facilities or Development with Special Fire Concerns. The proposed project would increase the allowable residential density, and the potential risks to future residences within the proposed project will be addressed in the EIR.

---

<sup>1</sup> City of Torrance, Community Development Department. Personal Communication. September 6, 2005.

<b>XI</b> <b><u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a)      Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 offsite?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 offsite?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)      Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)      Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h)      Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j)      Be subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

XI (a).      **Potentially Significant Impact.** Intensification of land uses within the District has the potential to result in increased stormwater and associated pollutants due to increased surface area. Potential impacts to existing water quality or waste discharge requirements will be evaluated qualitatively in the EIR. Requirements of the NPDES permit, including the new Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) required by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board (LARWQCB) under the Clean Water Act (Section 402), will also be examined in the EIR.

XI (b).      **Potentially Significant Impact.** The majority of the project area is developed. According to the California Department of Water Resources, the project site is not located within the Los Angeles-Orange County coastal plain aquifer system. The proposed Peninsula Village Overlay project site would not directly use any groundwater to serve the potable water needs of the project area and would not directly deplete groundwater through extraction activities. Limited opportunities for groundwater recharge in the hillside areas are present. The proposed project will incrementally reduce the groundwater recharge that currently occurs by allowing for development of hillsides with residential uses. The proposed project would not significantly increase impervious surfaces; therefore it is not anticipated that groundwater recharge would be affected. However, there is the potential for perched groundwater to be encountered during excavation for subterranean structures. Procedures for handling shallow groundwater will be addressed in the EIR.

- XI (c). **No Impact.** Substantial alterations to the existing drainage pattern on site and in the surrounding area are not anticipated. Existing drainage patterns and resultant drainage patterns of the project will be evaluated in the EIR. There are no streams or drainages within the proposed project site. The EIR will evaluate the potential impacts of the project on the existing stormwater facilities within the study area.
- XI (d). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response XI (c) above.
- XI (e). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The existing project site is currently developed. A substantial increase in the amount of impervious surfaces within the project area is not expected. The EIR will evaluate the effect of the increased residential density on stormwater runoff and drainage facilities.
- XI (f). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response XI (a) above.
- XI (g). **No Impact.** There are no widespread 100-year flood problems in the City of Rolling Hills Estates. The City has been registered in the National Flood Insurance Program (NIFP) since 1979. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the administering agency for the insurance program, indicates that there are no widespread flooding problems in the City and, therefore, 100-year flood maps are not available or required. Participation in the program ensures coverage from any “flash flood,” “mudflow,” or “earth movement” so long as it can be directly tied to heavy rainfall caused by seasonal conditions. No impact is anticipated.
- XI (h). **No Impact.** Please refer to Response XI (g) above.
- XI (i). **No Impact.** The proposed Peninsula Village Overlay is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding since there are no drainages within the project area and there are no designated floodplains. According to the Generalized Risk Assessment in the Public Safety Element, the project area is not located within a Flood Hazard area.
- XI (j). **No Impact.** The project site is not located near any lakes, is uphill of the Palos Verdes Reservoir, and there is no potential for a seiche. According to the City of Rancho Palos Verdes and City of Rolling Hills Estates Joint Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan, the project site is not located on a coastal bluff, exposing it to the potential impact of a Pacific-wide tsunami. The project site is not located near any major open space areas that would expose the site to the potential of mudflow.

<b>XII AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>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. Would the project:</i>				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Responses:**

XII (a). **No Impact.** The project site is located in a developed area in the City of Rolling Hills Estates, which is an urbanized area of Los Angeles County. The proposed project site is zoned Commercial General and is not currently used for agricultural purposes. The project site and area properties are not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). The proposed project would allow an increase in residential density, which would not alter existing land uses.

XII (b). **No Impact.** No agricultural resources are identified in the City’s General Plan; thus, no agricultural resources are anticipated to be present on site. The site is not identified in the City’s General Plan as subject to a Williamson Act contract. As the site is not zoned as “Agricultural,” not currently used for agricultural purposes, and would not appear to conflict with a Williamson Act contract, no impacts are anticipated.

XII(c). **No Impact.** The proposed project would allow for an increase in residential density and would not alter existing land uses.

<b>XIII MINERAL RESOURCES</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

XIII (a). **No Impact.** The Palos Verdes Peninsula contains soil formations that include a variety of sedimentary rocks. As part of the mineral land classification of the greater Los Angeles area, all areas in the region were evaluated for the presence of significant mineral deposits. Most of the Palos Verdes Peninsula and the City of Rolling Hills Estates have been classified as areas where no significant sand and gravel resources are present, and little likelihood exists for their presence. No impacts upon mineral resources are anticipated.

XIII (b). **No Impact.** Please refer to Response XIII (a) above.

<b>XIV <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

- XIV (a). **Less Than Significant Impact.** The proposed project would increase the density of residential development within the project area, but would potentially be the same number of units allowed in the existing Mixed Use Overlay Zone. However, the total number of dwelling units allowed would be reduced and the proposed project would not substantially change the growth projections for the City. Population and housing issues will be analyzed in the EIR, and appropriate design guidelines will be introduced to mitigate any potentially significant impacts to population and housing.
- XVI (b). **Less Than Significant Impact.** There is currently no existing housing within the project area north of Dry Bank Drive. No existing housing will be displaced by the proposed project.
- XVI (c). **Less Than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response XVI (b) above.

<b>XV PUBLIC SERVICES</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
a) Fire protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

- XV (a). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Peninsula Village Overlay Zone would increase the density of residential development allowed in the project area and would result in a demand for fire services. The City of Rolling Hills Estates contracts with the Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire Protection District, which provides fire protection services to a number of incorporated cities and all unincorporated areas of Los Angeles. The nearest fire station to the project area is Los Angeles County Fire Station #106, located south of the project site at 413 Indian Peak Road at the end of Crossfield Avenue. The Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire Protection District will be contacted during the preparation of the EIR to determine if any impacts to public services would result from project implementation.
- XV (b). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Peninsula Village Overlay Zone would increase the density of residential development allowed in the project area and would result in a demand for police services. The City of Rolling Hills Estates contracts with the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department for police protection and law enforcement services. The main Sheriff’s station serving the City is located at 26123 Narbonne Avenue, Lomita, California. The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department will be contacted during preparation of the EIR to determine whether any impacts to public services would result from project implementation.
- XV (c). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The Peninsula Village Overlay Zone would increase the density of residential development allowed in the project area and would result in a demand for school services. The Palos Verdes Peninsula Unified School District will be contacted for preparation of the EIR to determine whether any impacts to local schools would result from project implementation.
- XV (d). **No Impact.** The proposed project is not anticipated to increase demand on other public services, since the overall level of development will be less than that currently approved. Appropriate agencies providing services to the project site will be contacted for the preparation of the EIR to determine whether any impacts to public services would result from project implementation.

<b>XVI UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

XVI (a). **Less Than Significant Impact.** The Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts maintain and operate the sewer system for the City of Rolling Hills Estates. The project site is served by Los Angeles County Sanitation District No. 2. Sewer lines are maintained by the County Department of Public Works, with sewage from the area conveyed through sewer mains into the Joint Water Pollution Control Plant (JWPCP) in Carson. With the reduction in dwelling units associated with the proposed project, potential wastewater generation would be reduced from that currently anticipated by the existing General Plan and Zoning. The Sanitation Districts will be contacted to determine whether any impacts to existing wastewater facilities would result from implementation from the proposed project. The EIR will address the impacts that the proposed project could have on the existing wastewater treatment facilities.

XVI (b). **Less Than Significant Impact.** Please refer to Response XVI (a) above. The California Water Service Company (CWSC) will be contacted for the preparation of the EIR to determine whether any impacts to water supply would result from the project. The EIR will address the impacts that the proposed project could have on the wastewater treatment facilities.

XVI (c). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The City of Rolling Hills Estates is served by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, which operates and maintains storm drains in the area. The proposed project site is currently developed with existing storm drain infrastructure. It is not expected that the proposed project would substantially increase runoff on the project site. However, the EIR will address any impacts on the storm water system and will identify appropriate mitigation measures to reduce impacts to less than significant.

XVI (d). **Less Than Significant Impact.** Water service in the City is provided by the CWSC, which purchases water from the Metropolitan Water District (MWD). MWD imports this water from the Colorado River, which is then stored at the Palos Verdes Reservoir. As the proposed project results in fewer dwelling units than currently provided for in the General Plan and Zoning Code, future demand for domestic water would be reduced from currently projected levels. The CWSC will be contacted for

preparation of the EIR to determine whether any impacts to water supply would result from the project.

- XVI (e). **Less Than Significant Impact.** See Response XVI (a) above.
- XVI (f). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Currently, much of the solid waste collected within the City by private haulers is disposed of within Los Angeles County. As the proposed project results in fewer residences than anticipated by the General Plan and Zoning Code, future solid waste generation would be less than currently projected. The proposed project would be required to comply with all pertinent Citywide and/or Countywide recycling programs, including AB 939 compliance. All new development would also be conditioned to meet the requirements of all applicable solid waste diversion, storage, and disposal regulations that are in effect at the time of development. The Los Angeles County Integrated Waste Management will be contacted for preparation of the EIR to determine whether any impacts to landfills would result from the project.
- XVI (g). **Less Than Significant Impact.** Future construction projects and residents/businesses will be required to comply with the waste reduction and/or recycling City-initiated programs pursuant to AB 939 requirements. No impact is expected to occur.

<b>XVII <u>MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</u></b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Does the project:</i>				
a) 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?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Checklist Judgements:**

- XVII (a). **Potentially Significant Impact.** Based on the preceding discussion, the proposed project is not expected to degrade the quality of the biological environment nor affect any known historic resources. However, a biological assessment and cultural resource assessment will be completed as part of the EIR, and any potentially significant impacts along with mitigation measures will be addressed.
- XVII (b). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project, in conjunction with other projects in the City and general vicinity, has the potential to cumulatively impact the environment. The EIR will identify the environmental effects, reasonably foreseeable future development, and assess the proposed project's contribution to cumulative environmental impacts.
- XVII (c). **Potentially Significant Impact.** The proposed project has the potential to result in substantial environmental impacts to humans, such as aesthetics, noise, and air quality impacts. The EIR will assess the effects of the proposed project on the human environment.