



APPENDIX G

Environmental Checklist Form

1. Project title: Peninsula Villas

2. Lead Agency name and address:

City of Rolling Hills Estates, 4045 Palos Verdes Drive North, Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274

3. Contact person and phone number: Mr. David Wahba, Planning Director (310) 377-1577

4. Project location: On a regional basis, the subject property is located in the southwest portion of Los Angeles County on the Palos Verdes Peninsula. More specifically, the project is proposed at the site of an existing surface parking area on the west portion of a lot containing an existing 29,115 square-foot, 2-story, 30-foot tall office building with surface parking areas for 155 vehicles and access driveways surrounding the building along the rear, east and west sides at 901 Deep Valley Drive in the City of Rolling Hills Estates. Exhibits 1 and 2 depict the site on a regional and local basis, respectively.

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Palos Verdes Professional Center, 927 Deep Valley Drive, Rolling Hills Estates, CA 90274, Ted Wynne

6. General Plan designation: Commercial General with Hazards Management and Mixed Use Overlays

7. Zoning: Commercial General (CG)

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets, if necessary.)

Location

The 3.36-acre (146,270 square feet) property is located at 901 Deep Valley Drive, in the heart of the City's commercial district. The property is proposed to be subdivided into 2 "lots:" Lot A and Lot B. Lot A, the easterly portion of the property, is 1.51 acres (64,982 square feet) and is developed with a 2-story, 30-foot tall office building, and supporting surface parking area with 99 parking spaces. In the office building, 14,126 square feet (48.5 percent) is reserved for/occupied by medical office uses and 15,189 square feet (51.5 percent) is reserved for/occupied by general/administrative office uses. Lot B, the westerly and southerly portions of the site, is proposed for development of the project, a senior housing facility. Lot B is 1.86 acres (81,288 square feet). Currently, 56 surface parking spaces are provided in the westerly portion of Lot B to support the office building on Lot A.

Exhibit 1 - Project Location Map**Exhibit 2 – Site Vicinity Map****Project Characteristics**

The applicant is proposing to construct condominiums for active senior citizens on Lot B at the western portion of the site. The 44-foot tall, three-story structure will contain 41 separate dwelling units, including 28 two-bedroom, 7 one-bedroom, and 6 two-bedroom units with a den. **Exhibit 3, Typical Building Floor Plans**, shows the floor plan for each of the 3 floors. Each unit will include a full kitchen and washing machine and dryer hookups. The project proposes to provide 41 assigned and 11 unassigned parking spaces, totaling 52 parking spaces, within a semi-subterranean garage structure, with access provided by the way of Deep Valley Drive. In addition, one access driveway currently serving Lot A will be eliminated. **Exhibits 4A and 4B, Typical Units**, shows the layout for the various units proposed.

An entry lobby of 930 square feet would be located on the ground floor. In addition, approximately 1,526 square feet of interior space with an adjacent 2,150 square foot outdoor patio is located on the ground floor. This is intended for use as flex space serving as either commercial/retail or senior residential community uses. Two communal recreational areas are proposed within the facility; an interior courtyard and patio on the first floor and a rooftop deck accessed by way of the third floor. In addition, a senior recreational trail accessible from the second floor deck at the rear of the building will traverse the hillside for approximately 320 feet, ending at a picnic area. The remainder of Lot B, the slope, will remain landscaped.

Ancillary uses include utility space for mechanical equipment such as boilers, electrical panels, and emergency generators. On Lot A, the applicant is proposing to reconfigure the surface parking spaces and enhance landscaped areas. Along Deep Valley Drive, the landscaping at the west end of the building is designed to conform with the architectural design of the entry pavilion associated with the proposed condominiums to the west. The applicant is also proposing to add 200 square feet of new commercial/retail space to the existing medical/office building adjacent to the existing entry and to architecturally restyle the exterior of the existing building to match the proposed condominium structure. **Table 1** provides a breakdown of proposed land uses.

Exhibit 3**Exhibit 4A****Exhibit 4B**

Table 1
Summary of Proposed Uses

Land Use	Description	Amount
Lot B		
Residential	Two-bedroom units	34 units
	One-bedroom units	7 units
	Total:	41 units
Community Facilities	Senior community room, lobby,	2,356 square feet

Parking	Resident and guest parking	41 parking stalls
	Shared commercial/ residential parking	11 parking stalls
	Total:	52 parking stalls
Lot A		
Commercial	Office and medical office space	29,115 square feet (existing)
		200 square feet (new)
Parking	Office parking	111 parking stalls
	Total:	111 parking stalls

Exhibit 5 depicts the ground floor site plan. As shown, the first floor contains a lobby and a senior community room, both accessible from doors opening onto Deep Valley Drive. The parking garage is located on the ground floor at the rear of the property and contains room for 52 parking spaces. Site access is provided by a 20-foot wide entryway accessed off of Deep Valley Drive.

Exhibits 6A and 6B provide conceptual building elevations. As shown, the building exterior utilizes a variety of roof pitches and terraces to create diversity in building mass, bulk, and height. The architectural style also employs decorative beam soffits, trellises, and wrought iron fencing to convey character to the design. Landscape features include a landscaped entryway using flowering accent trees as well as shrubs and vines and a fountain. Walkways are lined with concrete pavers.

Infrastructure and Construction Process

Implementation of the proposed senior condominium facility would involve several phases including demolition of the existing surface parking area, earthwork necessary to cut back the existing slope and shore it with a retaining wall, and construction of the new building and surface parking areas. This process is anticipated to occur within a 12-month period.

Exhibit 5

Exhibit 6A

Exhibit 6B

It is estimated that approximately 900 cubic yards of soil will be excavated to reconfigure the slope located on the southern portion of the property for adequate drainage and stability. Once the slope has been re-contoured, tie back anchors will be driven into the soil with a pneumatic drill. Piles that will be poured in place into pre-drilled holes will structurally support the building itself.

All of the soil and rubble will require export off the site. Approximately 45 truck trips will be required to export the soil and rubble to an as yet unknown recipient location over an approximately one to two month period. The haul route will use Deep Valley Drive and Silver Spur Road to reach Crenshaw Boulevard, at which point trucks would turn north on Crenshaw Boulevard.

The project applicant will utilize existing dry and wet utilities that present serve the property. Water, sewer, drainage, power, and other necessary utilities are provided in conduits located within the rights-of-way of adjacent roadways. All improvements constructed for the proposed project will be designed and constructed to the specifications and codes of the City.

Requested Actions

The project is located in General Plan Land Use Planning Area No. 6 and the site is subject to General Plan Overlay Designations that provide additional development requirements above and beyond those included in the General Plan Land Use Designation. The applicable Overlay Designations are:

Hazards Management Overlay – this designation applies to the central portion of Planning Area 6, which is traversed by the Cabrillo Fault. The Public Safety Element of the General Plan indicates specific guidelines that must be adhered to when planning and developing in these areas.

Mixed Use Overlay – this designation applies to that portion of the planning area designated for Commercial General use. This designation permits residential uses adjacent to or above commercial retail and office uses not to exceed 22 dwelling units/acre. All pertinent height and parking standards also apply to the uses in this overlay.

The proposed project requests the following City discretionary actions:

- **A Conditional Use Permit (CUP)** to allow a 41-unit active senior (55 and older) condominium project in the Commercial General (C-G)/Mixed Use Overlay Zone.
- **A Precise Plan of Design (PPD)** is required for: (1) site and building improvements including demolition of existing on-site improvements (parking lot and landscaping) and construction of condominiums; and (2) façade improvements to and a 200-square foot expansion of an associated existing office building.
- **Variiances** are required to permit: (1) smaller parking space dimensions than required by Code; and (2) fewer parking stalls than required by Code.
- **A Tentative Tract Map** for a one-lot subdivision for the sale of condominiums is required.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The surrounding area is principally developed with commercial retail and office land uses. To the north of the site is a well developed shopping center. This center fronts on Silver Spur Road, with the rear facing Deep Valley Drive. To the east is a large 3-story, 42-foot tall medical building with a 48+-foot, 4-story stair tower, and 2-story parking structure. To the west is the parking lot ramp and parking structure for the U.S. Post Office building. Crenshaw Boulevard, a major thoroughfare, is adjacent to the rear of the property, along with an additional lot designated CG adjacent to Crenshaw Boulevard.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

None.

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 type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

Determination: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
<input type="checkbox"/>	I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	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

Printed Name

For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained

where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off site as well as on site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, and 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 "Earlier Analyses," as described in 5) below, 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 normally 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.

Issues:

I. AESTHETICS. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in the loss of any City designated areas for hiking and/or riding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Contrast with the surrounding development and/or scenic resources due to the project's height, mass, bulk, grading, signs, setbacks, colors or landscape?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Obstruct the public's view of (i) scenic resources, (ii) a scenic corridor, or (iii) a vista as identified on a case-by-case basis?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Be located along a City designated scenic or view corridor and will contrast with the surrounding development and/or scenic resources due to the project's height, mass, bulk, grading, signs, setbacks, colors or landscape?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Incorporate a new electrical service box and/or utility lines above ground?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Be located within a view corridor, scenic corridor or vista, and will include unscreened outdoor uses or equipment inconsistent with the rural character, as defined by the City of Rolling Hills Estates General Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
k. Remove natural features, or add man-made features or structures, which will substantially degrade the scenic corridor or vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
l. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which will adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area that will exceed the standards established in the Municipal Code, illuminate areas outside the project boundary, or and or use excessive reflective building material?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a.-c.,e.,g.,h.,k. The location and topography of the City provide views of the ocean located to the south and the Los Angeles Basin to the north. In addition, the extensive trail network provides an interconnected series of greenbelts, giving residents views of natural landscape. A number of plans and policies concerned with the preservation of scenic views and vistas within the City have been implemented. The primary form of regulation is through the application of a Scenic Roadways Overlay Zone, which is placed on those roads identified as scenic highways. The guidelines used to define such corridors include, but are not limited to, consideration of unique topographic or natural features of interest, historic places or sites of interest, areas which characterize the rural form of the City, and which are a significant entry into the City.

The site is in an urban portion of the City and itself is developed with a 2-story, 29,115-square-foot office building and 155-space surface parking lot. No trails traverse the site. In fact, the Conservation Element of the City of Rolling Hills Estates General Plan does not place a scenic corridor overlay designation along Deep Valley Drive, which fronts the property. Crenshaw Boulevard, which abuts the rear of the property, and Silver Spur Road, one street north of Deep Valley Drive, are designated scenic corridors. However, the project site is not visible to automobiles driving along Crenshaw Boulevard as the road is elevated approximately 60 feet above the site, or to pedestrians or vehicles traveling along Deep Valley Drive, as the site is blocked from view by the shopping center which fronts on Silver Spur Road.

The architectural design of the building includes the use of parapets to screen roof-mounted mechanical equipment, and landscape plans call for the use of flowering accent trees, vines, and shrubs along the building perimeter, with particular emphasis along the frontage on Deep Valley Drive. The southerly portion of Lot B, the slope behind the buildings, will include a senior recreation trail that extends along the slope. On Lot A, the applicant is proposing to enhance existing landscaped areas. Along Deep Valley Drive, the landscaping at the west end of the building is designed to conform with the architectural design of the entry pavilion associated with the proposed condominiums to the west.

Development of the project site would not remove any natural or man-made scenic resources such as trees, rock outcroppings, or historic buildings and/or block the views of any such features that are defined as scenic corridors or vistas by the General Plan. Based on the above, no significant impact with respect to these criteria would occur with site development as proposed.

f. The project is located in a Commercial General corridor that contains a number of multi-story buildings and no scenic views of any type. As described later in the response to checklist item **IX.(i)**, the proposed development is within the maximum building square footage permitted for the Commercial General zoning designation; so building mass and bulk would not contrast with the existing commercial retail and office development surrounding the property. The proposed project would be 44 feet in height, the allowable height in this district. Furthermore, the project meets the three-story maximum contained in §17.30.050(f) of the City's Zoning Code. No significant impacts are anticipated.

i.,j. The project site is not located along a scenic corridor. Electrical and other utility services are to be provided by connection to an existing, subterranean utility vault, so these items will not be visible. The architectural design of the building also includes the use of parapets to screen roof-mounted mechanical equipment, and landscape plans call for the use of flowering accent trees, vines, and shrubs along the building perimeter, with particular emphasis along the frontage with Deep Valley Drive. No impact is anticipated.

d.,l. The subject property is developed with an office building and surface parking areas and presently contains exterior lighting to illuminate signage, and provide for public safety and security. Existing illumination sources associated with the surface parking area on the west

would be eliminated and replaced with project lights that direct illumination to the public walkways and parking entrances on the project driveway. Project-related light sources would be subject to lighting-related requirements contained in the Municipal Code, and the building's exterior is made from non-reflective stucco rather than glass or other highly reflective building material. Given the above, the project would not increase ambient light levels above that presently experienced in the area.

Further Study Required:

No further study is required.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

Documentation:

a. 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 identified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the State Important Farmlands Map.

b. No agricultural resources are identified in the City's General Plan; thus, no agricultural resources are anticipated to be present on the project site. The site is not identified in the City's General Plan as subject to a Williamson Act contract. As the site is neither zoned as "Agricultural," nor currently used for agricultural purposes nor would it appear to conflict with a Williamson Act contract, no impacts are anticipated.

c. The project site is not currently used for agricultural purposes. Additionally, the development of the project site would not, in any way, hinder the operations of any existing agricultural practices or convert existing farmland to developed uses.

Further Study Required:

No further analysis is required regarding agriculture resources.

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Fail to meet the applicable state and federal air quality plans because (i) the project causes or contributes to emission of identified air pollutants in excess of levels stated in the plans, or (ii) the project will fail to implement a remedial or mitigation measure required under the appropriate plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in emission of identified pollutants in excess of the pounds per day or tons per quarter standards established by SCAQMD?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard or regulation (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"/>
f. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people (e.g., because the project will cause an odiferous emission, including emissions resulting from vehicles, that is noxious, putrid, has an appreciable chemical smell, or has an appreciable smell of human or animal waste, rendering, or by-products)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a. With regard to Air Quality Plans, the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) control strategy is based on projections from local general plans. For this reason, projects that are consistent with

local general plans are considered consistent with air quality related regional plans, such as the AQMP. As discussed later under response to checklist item **IX.(i)**, development of the proposed project is consistent with the City of Rolling Hills Estates General Plan, which allows development of up to 22 residential units per acre in the General Commercial Zone with Mixed Use Overlay. Consequently, the City of Rolling Hills Estates and the AQMP have accounted for the increase in population associated with this development.

b.–e.

Background

The project is located within the South Coast Air Basin, a 6,000 square-mile area encompassing all of Orange County and the non-desert portions of Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino Counties. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) regulates air quality in this Basin.

To monitor the concentrations of air pollutants in the Basin, the SCAQMD has divided the Basin into Source Receptor Areas (SRAs) in which 33 air quality-monitoring stations are operated. Data from these monitoring stations consistently registers values that are among the highest levels of smog in the United States and, therefore, the SCAB region is considered to have the worst air quality in the nation.

The federal and state Clean Air Acts (CAA) require the preparation of plans to bring air emissions within healthful levels. The SCAQMD has responded to this requirement by preparing a series of AQMP, the most recent of which was adopted by the governing board on August 1, 2003. This AQMP, referred to as the 2003 AQMP, was prepared to comply with the provisions of the 1989 California Clean Air Act (CCAA) and the 1990 Federal CAA amendments, to accommodate growth, to reduce the high levels of pollutants within the Basin, to meet state and federal air quality standards, and to minimize the fiscal impact pollution control measures have on the local economy. The 2003 AQMP incorporates the latest emissions inventory, the latest modeling techniques, updated control measures remaining from the 1997/1999 State Implementation Program and new control measures based on current technology assessments.

The 2003 AQMP projects attainment of both federal and state air quality requirements and bases these projections on several assumptions. For example, the AQMP assumes general development projects will be constructed in accordance with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) population growth projections published in its *Regional Comprehensive Plan & Guide*, and that general development projects will implement strategies (mitigation measures) to reduce emissions generated during their construction and operation. Projects which are consistent with the growth projections and which implement all feasible mitigation measures are generally considered consistent with the AQMP.

Specific rules and regulations have been adopted by the SCAQMD Governing Board which limit the emissions that can be generated by various uses and/or activities, and identify specific pollution reduction measures which must be implemented in association with various uses and activities. These rules not only regulate the emissions of the six criteria pollutants identified in the CAA, but also toxic emissions and acutely hazardous materials. They are also subject to ongoing refinement by SCAQMD.

In April 1993, the SCAQMD prepared its *CEQA Air Quality Handbook (Handbook)* as a guide to assist local government agencies and consultants in preparing environmental documents for projects subject to CEQA. The *Handbook* is intended to provide local governments and CEQA practitioners with guidance for analyzing and mitigating project specific air quality impacts. The *Handbook* provides standards, methodologies, and procedures for conducting air quality analysis in EIRs.

Analysis

Construction emissions for new developments are usually associated with grading and earthwork. During construction, it is difficult, if not impossible, at this stage, to precisely quantify the daily and quarterly emissions associated with the proposed construction activities on the one-acre site. Until detailed grading and infrastructure plans are prepared for the project, the level of information needed to execute a highly detailed construction emissions model for the project is unavailable. However, construction emissions will be short-term in nature and would be limited only to the time period when construction activity is taking place. Therefore, construction emissions will not add to long-term air quality degradation. Further, the Proposed Project must implement standard SCAQMD-approved construction procedures, such as those provided in Tables 11-2 and 11-3 of the *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (for exhaust emissions), and comply with applicable provisions of the most recently adopted SCAQMD Rule 403 and Rule 403 Implementation Handbook (for fugitive dust emissions). Based on the above, construction-related emissions would not be considered significant with implementation of the mitigation outlined below.

Operational emissions will be generated by both stationary and mobile sources as a result of normal day-to-day activity on the project site after occupation. Stationary emissions will be generated by the consumption of natural gas for space and water heating devices (including boilers), and from electric power generation sources. Mobile emissions would be generated by motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site. Emissions of criteria pollutants associated with the project were calculated using the URBEMIS 2002 computer model and are presented in **Table 2**.

Table 2				
Estimated Operational Emissions				
Emissions Source	Emissions in Pounds per Day			
	CO	VOC	NO_x	PM₁₀
Operations (Vehicle) Emission Estimates	18.65	1.89	1.67	1.43
Area Source Emission Estimates	1.18	1.83	0.44	0.00
Totals:	19.83	3.72	2.11	1.43
Recommended Threshold:	550.0	55.0	55.0	150.0
Exceeds Threshold?:	NO	NO	NO	NO
<i>Source: Impact Sciences, Inc. Emissions calculations are provided in Appendix A. Totals in table may not appear to add exactly due to rounding in the computer model calculations.</i>				

As shown, operation of uses proposed by the project would generate a volume of air pollutants that are well below the thresholds established by the SCAQMD *Handbook* and project operation would not significantly contribute to an existing air quality violation nor contribute to the violation of an air quality standard. Based on the above, the project would have no significant impact with implementation of mitigation.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1. The Project Applicant shall prepare a fugitive dust control plan that meets the requirements outlined in SCAQMD Rule 403. The plan shall be submitted for review and approval of the SCAQMD prior to issuance of grading permits.

AQ-2. The Project Applicant shall properly maintain equipment and vehicle engines and as per manufacturers' specifications and per SCAQMD rules to minimize exhaust emissions.

f. Sensitive receptors are populations that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than are the population at large. The SCAQMD identifies the following as sensitive receptors: long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities.

Carbon monoxide (CO) "hot spots," or areas of high CO concentration, can occur at traffic congested roadway intersections as a result of accumulating vehicle CO emissions. A significant air quality impact would occur where sensitive receptors are exposed to CO levels that exceed state or federal standards. The project site fronts onto Deep Valley Drive, which has adequate levels of service and low potential to contain a CO hotspot. Consequently, placement of the proposed senior condominiums at the proposed site would not expose project residents to a CO hotspot. Furthermore, the results of air quality modeling described above indicate that operation of the project would generate CO emissions that fall below the SCAQMD significance thresholds, so the project would not contribute a cumulatively considerable net increase in CO levels in the project area.

In addition, no manufacturing or industrial type land uses that utilize hazardous materials or emit toxic vapors are present in the vicinity of the site. Furthermore, the project itself is a residential and commercial oriented project that would not contain hazardous materials other than those associated with common cleaning products. Based on the above, no significant exposure of sensitive land uses to concentrated pollutants is expected.

g. The proposed project consists of construction and operation of senior condominiums and a parking garage. No significant odors are anticipated from the type of use proposed. Any unforeseen odors will be controlled in accordance with SCAQMD permit requirements for proper air filtration and SCAQMD Rule 402, which prohibits persons from discharging quantities of air contaminants, which cause nuisance to any considerable number of persons.

Further Study Required:

No further study is required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Be located in a high ecological sensitivity area as defined by the General Plan, and will not preserve ecological habitat found at the project site in accordance with the General Plan Conservation Element (excluding minor lot improvements undertaken by an individual homeowner)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Conflict with General Plan policies for protecting biological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Result in the loss of any portion of (i) an Environmentally Sensitive Area as defined by the City of Rolling Hills Estates, (ii) a natural undeveloped canyon or (iii) a hillside area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Generate biological resource impacts, which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a.-j. The project site is in an urban portion of the City and not located within an area containing high ecological sensitivity as identified by an Ecological Overlay Zones. A variety of common wildlife species are present within the City and may utilize the site for foraging or nesting. Common birds that inhabit nearby areas include: the mourning dove, spotted dove, house finch or linnnet, hummingbird, scrub jay, mockingbird, sparrow, and brown towhee. A computerized record search was conducted, using the Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB) of the California Department of Fish and Game, to document the known occurrences of Endangered species in the City. The data base, consisting of information obtained from federal and state agencies, identified plants and animals found in the Peninsula that have been listed as Endangered, Rare, or Threatened, as well as those considered by the scientific community to be Endangered. A summary of the record search is discussed below.

- The Palos Verdes blue butterfly (*Glaucopsyche lygdamus palosverdesensis*) is a small blue butterfly that may have evolved during the Pleistocene period, when the Peninsula was an island. In 1977, the butterfly was found in only eight colonies on the Palos Verdes Peninsula, where the caterpillars fed on a wild species of locoweed (*Astragalus*). The butterfly was first discovered in 1976 in a large coastal scrub terrace near Alta Vista Way within the City of Rancho Palos Verdes. In 1978, road and housing construction destroyed this habitat. The butterfly was spotted again, in 1981, near the intersection of Seacrest Road and Crenshaw Boulevard and along Crenshaw Boulevard between Altamira and Portuguese Canyons. Grading activities in 1982 and 1983 destroyed the habitat near Seacrest and Crenshaw. The *Astragalus* habitat along Crenshaw Boulevard has been reduced, and no more butterfly sightings have been made in this area.
- The California gnatcatcher (*Ptilioptila californica*) is a tiny and very active gray or olive bird, with an eye ring or line over the eye and body. The California gnatcatcher is on the federal listing as Endangered. The species is presumed to still be in existence in the project area. In 1989, several pairs of the gnatcatcher were observed in the Marineland area, around Sunnyridge Road in the City of Rolling Hills, along Forrestal Road in Rancho Palos Verdes, and in the Agua Amarga Canyon in Rolling Hills Estates. These areas are sage scrub and coastal sage scrub habitats where California sagebrush, wild buckwheat, and black sage are abundant. The proposed project site does not contain any habitat considered to be suitable gnatcatcher habitat.
- The Mohave tui chub (*Gila bicolor mohavensis*) is a chunky fish with an olive-brown back and a white-to-silver belly. The Mohave tui chub once inhabited the deep pools and slough-like areas of the Mohave River. Today, this river and its lakes are desert playas (dry lakes). The construction of reservoirs on the Mohave has altered its flow and direction, and the chubs have interbred with several introduced species. Very few genetically pure Mohave tui chubs could be found in 1967. The Mohave tui chub is listed as an Endangered species in both federal and state listings. Attempts to transplant the Mohave tui chub have generally failed. Transplants at the South Coast Botanic Garden were temporarily successful, but the species has become extinct since 1976.
- The Mexican flannelbush plant (*Fremontodendron marcanum*) is a Category 2 candidate species in the federal listing and Rare in the California listing. Rare species are species whose occurrences are threatened and/or will soon be threatened. The Mexican flannelbush is found in chaparral habitat, most of which has been destroyed in the area. Solitary flannelbush may be found on the hillsides, oak woodland, and chaparral areas, approximately one mile from the ocean on Via Del Monte.

The proposed project will not impact these sensitive species or their habitats. The site of the proposed project is presently developed with an office building and surface parking areas. No natural plant communities or protected natural communities are found on site and the property is not in an area designated as critical habitat for any sensitive wildlife species nor is the area subject to any conservation plans, recovery plans, or similar policies and ordinances. The vegetation and animal species supported in the man-made habitat include species that are commonly found in urban environments. As a result, the proposed project would not significantly impact biological resources.

Further Study Required:

No further analysis is required regarding biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES.				
<i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5, or any other section of the California Code of Regulations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5, or any other section of the California Code of Regulations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. 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"/>

Documentation:

a.,b.,d.,e. Intensive archaeological investigations have been made to trace human evolution in California. The tribes of the Gabrielino or Canalino Indians, the last of the three separate Indian groups, inhabited the Palos Verdes Peninsula. The Gabrielinos were peaceful Indians who lived as seafarers, fishermen, and traders. Ten villages are believed to have occupied the Peninsula. Most village sites were located near a supply of water and were safe from winter floods. Malaga Cove is the best-known site of early habitation. Other villages in the Peninsula include the Suangna, Masaungna, Xuxungna, Kingkingna, Tsauvingna, Harasngna, Ataviangna, and Munikangna.

Records from the Archaeological Information Center show that eleven prehistoric sites have been identified within the City. Three of the sites are in the southwestern section of the City, in the Rolling Hills Estates Park area. Seven sites are located in the northeastern section of the City at the quarry site, Montecillo area, Palos Verdes Reservoir, and the Rolling Hills Country Club. The quarry site is believed to have once been the site of an Indian village and burial ground covering several acres.

The project site is not located within a City-designated Cultural Resource Overlay Zone. There are no prehistoric or historic structures or objects on site or within adjacent areas. Any archaeological resources that may have been present prior to development would have likely been destroyed due to the previous disturbance necessary to construct the existing office building and related facilities upon archaeological resources.

c. The Peninsula is underlain by sediments from the erosion of the San Gabriel Mountains to the north, which have accumulated over many years. Seashell fossils are found at higher elevations on the Peninsula while fish and sea mammals are generally found at lower elevations. Fossils of a complete whale, mastodon tusks and other such fossils have been uncovered over the years and preserved in local museums. 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 facilities located on site.

Further Study Required:

No further analysis is required regarding cultural resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
f. Involve modifications on slopes greater than 2:1?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a.i.,ii. Any development that occurs within the geographical boundaries of Southern California has the potential to expose people and/or structures to potentially adverse effects involving fault rupture, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure (including liquefaction), or landslides.

The Palos Verdes Peninsula itself lies at the juncture of a number of known active fault systems.

Detectable ground shaking in the City of Rolling Hills Estates may be caused by earthquakes occurring on a number of faults in the area, including the San Andreas, Palos Verdes, Newport-Inglewood, Cabrillo, Redondo Canyon, and Santa Monica-Malibu Coast Fault systems. The intensity of seismic ground shaking at any given location is influenced by the magnitude of the earthquake, the distance to the epicenter, and local geologic and topographic conditions. The amount of damage generally depends on the size, shape, age, and engineering characteristics of affected structures.

The project site is within a Hazards Management Overlay District because the Cabrillo Fault traverses the general area. The Cabrillo Fault is classified as active, based on offset Holocene (younger than 11,000 years) sediments along its offshore segments, and on scattered micro-earthquakes. A maximum credible earthquake on this fault would generate peak horizontal ground accelerations of up to 0.5 to 0.6g throughout the City.

Ground motion and related hazards resulting from earthquakes along any of the aforementioned faults may result in significant seismic related hazards. The potential for fault rupture is addressed at the state level by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. The legislature's intent was to provide a statewide seismic hazards mapping and technical advisory program to assist cities and counties in fulfilling their responsibilities for protecting the public health and safety from the effects of strong ground shaking, liquefaction, landslides, ground failure, and other seismic hazards caused by earthquakes.

Under the Government Code requirement, cities and counties must require, prior to the approval of a project located in a seismic hazard zone, a geotechnical report defining and delineating any seismic hazard. If the local jurisdiction finds that no undue hazard of this kind exists, based on information resulting from studies conducted on site or in the immediate vicinity of the project, the requirement for a geotechnical report may be waived.

No special study zones have been identified within the City. However, the act allows individual jurisdictions to create special study zones around faults not yet recognized by the state as active. According to the Public Safety Element of the Rolling Hills Estates General Plan, the surface rupture potential of the onshore segments of the Cabrillo Fault segments is credible. Consequently, the City has created a Hazards Management Overlay District along the fault alignment, which includes the project site. Development proposed within the Hazards Management Overlay District must comply with the provisions of the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act requiring preparation of a site-specific geotechnical investigation.

Consistent with City policy, a site-specific geotechnical report was conducted by T.I.N. Engineering Company in November 2003 and can be viewed in its entirety in **Appendix B**. The report indicates that the upper 13 feet of soil is fill material consisting of grayish brown and black, mixed moist, moderately soft to stiff silty clay and adobe clay with bedrock fragments. Below the fill, slope wash or alluvium is encountered. The reports concluded that the existing fill, slope wash and alluvium on site were loose and soft and are not considered suitable for slab and foundation supports due to a high potential for settlement. In order to comply with construction requirements related to seismic concerns, mitigation measures were proposed by the geotechnical report. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures recommended by the geotechnical report, the project will result in less than significant impacts related to strong seismic shaking or rupture of an earthquake fault.

a.iii. Liquefaction is not typically a concern because most of the City is underlain by consolidated bedrock and is not susceptible to liquefaction. Liquefaction occurs in loose, sandy soils or alluvium that are exposed to high groundwater tables. Exploratory borings conducted on the project site excavated to a depth of between 22 and 28 feet below the surface. Neither boring encountered groundwater or freestanding water at the depth penetrated for the borings, so liquefaction is not anticipated as a significant geologic hazard.

a.iv.,f. Soils on the subject site consist of artificial fill and native clayey silt and silty clay that are underlain by Alta Mira Shale, which is a member of the Monterey Formation (Tma). This type of interbedded unit has planes of weakness that are conducive to ground failure such as land sliding and slope instability.

The applicant is proposing to cut back the toe of the slope to create sufficient space to place the building pad. If not properly designed and constructed, this action could result in slope failure and potentially loss of life and property damage. Slope stability of the site was analyzed as part of the geotechnical report. It was determined that the existing fill, slope wash, and alluvium were loose or soft and are not considered suitable for slab and foundation supports due to a high potential for settlement. The report recommended that the proposed apartment building be located on spread footing or pile foundations into firm bedrock. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures recommended in the geotechnical report, impacts related to soil stability and landslides will be reduced to a less than significant level.

b. Site runoff from impervious, developed portions of the site would be subject to the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) during both construction and operation of uses. As part of this permit process, the applicant is required to submit a Notice of Intent listing the Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be used in order to comply with nationwide permit provisions prior to construction activities that disturb between 1 and 5 acres of land area. This plan will identify BMPs appropriate and applicable to the project that address construction site cleanliness, and erosion control measures to minimize sedimentation and water quality impacts during construction activity.

c. Secondary seismic hazards such as lateral spreading, dynamic settlement or liquefaction are generally associated with relatively high intensity ground shaking experienced in areas with a high groundwater table and loose, sandy soils or alluvium. The exploratory borings conducted on the project site were excavated to a depth of 22 and 28 feet below the surface. Neither boring encountered groundwater or freestanding water at the depth penetrated for the borings. No impacts are anticipated related to lateral spreading, dynamic settlement or liquefaction as a result of the project development.

d. Expansive soils are primarily comprised of clays, which increase in volume when water is absorbed and shrink when dry. Expansive soils are of concern since building foundations may rise during the rainy season and fall during dry periods in response to the clay's action. If movement varies under different parts of the building, structural portions of the building may distort. Soil borings were excavated as part of the geotechnical analysis of the site. It was determined that the on-site soils are considered to be expansive soils and design and construction procedures are necessary to mitigate expansive soil concerns. Mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce impacts related to expansive soils below a level considered to be significant.

e. The project will connect to existing sewer trunk located within the Deep Valley Drive right-of-way. No impact to this category will occur with project construction.

Mitigation Measures

As stated in the project geotechnical report, the following recommendations shall be incorporated into the design and construction of the project. Further, description of the design specifications that are required are discussed in greater detail in the geotechnical report.

GEO-1. The existing fill, slope wash, and alluvium are loose or soft and are not considered suitable for slab foundation supports due to a high potential for settlement. Therefore, the proposed apartment building shall be founded on spread footings or pile foundations into firm bedrock based on the design specifications identified in the geotechnical report. The depth of the firm bedrock is estimated to vary from 9 to 15 feet below the existing grade.

GEO-2. The on-site soil is considered to be an expansive soil. The retaining walls for the proposed parking garage shall be designed to the specifications identified in the geotechnical report, with respect to the expansive soil conditions found on the project site.

GEO-3. If pile foundations are used for support of the proposed building, structural slabs shall be used in the proposed on-grade slab areas. Alternatively, fill, slope wash or alluvium may be removed and recompact to at least 90 percent of the maximum dry density for support of the proposed on-grade slabs. Limits of the unsuitable fills or soils shall be labeled on the final grading plans by the project architect or project civil engineers.

GEO-4. On-site bedrock testing resulted in a sulfate content over 150 ppm. Therefore, type II cement shall be utilized for the project site.

Further Study Required:

No further analysis is required with respect to geology and soils.

VII. HAZARDS. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Impair implementation of or physically	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Be located in the Hazard Management Overlay Zone?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Create a substantial hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Create a substantial 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a.,b. The proposed project will not be involved in the storage and distribution of large quantities of materials that may be considered hazardous. The Uniform Building Code, County of Los Angeles Department of Environmental Health, County of Los Angeles Fire Department and OSHA regulate the use, storage, and handling of hazardous materials. Building plans will also be reviewed by the City and Los Angeles County to ensure that any applicable fire suppression improvements (sprinklers, hydrants, fire flow, etc.) are sufficient in accommodating demand. As a result, the proposed project's construction and subsequent operation will not result in any significant adverse impacts involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

c. The site is currently developed with an office building and surface parking areas. Future development contemplated will not be involved in any activities that would emit and/or handle hazardous materials. The proposed project will not generate harmful emissions that may affect local schools.

d. The site is currently developed with an office building and surface parking lot. The existing land uses are not involved in the storage and distribution of materials that may be considered hazardous, nor are such uses located adjacent to the subject site. Given these conditions, the property would not represent a hazardous material site.

e.,f. The City is located approximately 1.5 nautical miles south of Torrance Municipal Airport. Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) is located approximately 12.3 nautical miles to the northwest. The project is neither 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.

g. 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. At no time will any designated emergency evacuation routes be closed to traffic

due to future construction activities within the project site. No impact to this category is expected.

h. The site of the proposed project is located within a predominantly urban setting. Open area containing natural vegetation is found up-slope of the property on the south side. In fact, the Public Safety Element of the General Plan designates a portion of the adjacent slope approximately one mile west of the project site as having a moderate to high fire risk.

The project is required to comply with all pertinent fire code and ordinance requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire hydrants, and fire flows. Specific fire and life safety requirements will be addressed at the building fire plan check. There may be additional fire and life safety requirements during this time including, but not limited to annual brush clearing and fuel modification plans. Compliance with the fire code and ordinance requirements would reduce the risk below a level considered significant.

i. The project site is within a Hazards Management Overlay District because the Cabrillo Fault traverses the property. The Cabrillo Fault is classified as active and special design and building standards apply. Mitigation measures proposed in the **Geology and Soils** section to minimize seismic impacts to a less than significant level.

j.,k. Construction and operation of senior condominiums and associated parking does not require the extensive or ongoing use of materials with a significant hazardous potential. The occasional use of hazardous materials generally associated with these types of developments include the utilization or disposal of hazardous materials such as unused paint, aerosol cans, cleaning agents (solvents), and automotive supplies (by products). These materials are generally disposed of at non-hazardous Class II and III landfills (along with traditional solid waste). Therefore, the proposed project is not considered to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials potential or otherwise, given the appropriate procedures and guidelines are followed during the development and no potentially significant impacts are anticipated.

Further Study Required:

No further analysis is required with respect to health hazard created by the exposure to hazardous materials or air emissions.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?				
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a. Section 402 of the Federal Clean Water Act requires National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permits for storm water discharges from storm drain systems to "Waters of the United

States." Applicants for development projects in the County of Los Angeles, including the City of Rolling Hills Estates, have two major responsibilities under NPDES Municipal Permit No. CAS614001.

The first is to submit and then implement a Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) containing design features and BMPs appropriate and applicable to the project. The purpose of the SUSMP is to reduce post-construction pollutants in storm water discharges. Prior to issuance of any grading or building permit, the City must approve the SUSMP.

The second responsibility is to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for all construction projects with disturbed areas of 1 to 5 acres. The applicant must also conform to the State Construction Activity Storm Water Permit for projects greater than 1 acre. The applicant must ensure that a SWPPP is approved, and file a Notice of Intent to comply with the State Permit prior to issuance of a grading permit.

Specific mitigation measures have been incorporated into the SUSMPs and the SWPPPs for development projects under NPDES Municipal Permit No. CAS614001. Implementation of these measures will ensure that the quality of stormwater runoff leaving the project site will meet all regulatory standards and will maintain the beneficial uses of the surface water for public and commerce. The City of Rolling Hills Estates, as part of normal project approval and construction practice monitors compliance with these requirements. Based on the above, no significant impact is anticipated.

b. The proposed project would not directly use any groundwater to serve the project site; therefore, no substantial depletion to groundwater resources are anticipated. It should be noted that hardscape typically associated with building foundations, driveways and roadways will limit the amount of permeable surfaces. However, because the proposed site is presently paved, no decrease in the amount of permeable surfaces is expected to occur, so the proposed project will not interfere with groundwater recharge.

c.,d. Development of the proposed project will neither require substantial changes to the existing drainage pattern of the site, nor does the site contain a stream or river. As described above, the project site is presently developed and serviced by a stormwater collection and conveyance system. Consequently, the opportunity for the proposed project to contribute to substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on or off site is considered minimal.

e. The Los Angeles County Department of Public Works maintains the majority of the storm drains in the City of Rolling Hills Estates. Storm drains are designed to convey ten-year frequency storm flows. System performance is reviewed on a similar time scale. Storm drainage requirements are designed to prevent floods from rising above the curb-line and beyond the public right-of-way. Curb line inundation is not a direct threat to public safety.

New development in the City must conform to Los Angeles County Fire Code Standard No. 10.207(A), which requires special drains located in the vicinity of fire hydrants, and states that private access roads must be designed to withstand (not undermine) a capital flood (a flood capable of occurring on an approximate 250-year flood return interval).

As indicated previously, there will not be a significant change in the amount of surface runoff volumes on site due to the nature and extent of the existing impervious surfaces. The nature and extent of stormwater runoff ultimately discharged into the existing storm drain system will not significantly change due to the amount of existing impervious surfaces found on site, and thus, no impacts regarding runoff are expected.

f. Refer to response to checklist item **VIII.a**. No impacts under this category will occur.

g.-j. There are no widespread 100-year flood problems in the City of Rolling Hills Estates. Flash flooding does not present a direct threat to public safety in the canyon areas, since development is not permitted in these areas. The City of Rolling Hills Estates has been registered in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) 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.

In compliance with the NFIP, Rolling Hills Estates administers a flood management ordinance (Ordinance 299) whereby conditions are defined in order to develop in areas subject to flood hazard. In practice, however, canyon areas are the only natural flood hazard, and they are generally designated as open space. Storm-induced flood problems in the City, as defined by the NFIP, would include flash floods in the canyon areas, saturated mudflows on the hillsides, and shallow flooding in streets and residences associated with poor storm drainage. Due to the small

size of the canyon watersheds in the City, most flash floods in the canyons are short-lived. The project site is not located within a canyon that may be subject to flash flooding. As a result, no impacts related to the placement of housing within a 100-year flood zone are anticipated.

Further Study Required:

No further analysis is required regarding hydrology and water quality.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with 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 (e.g., development standards, design guidelines)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 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"/>
d. Incorporate 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"/>
e. Detract substantially from the rural character as defined in the Rolling Hills Estates General Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Incorporate a use not currently permitted by the General Plan and the Land Use Map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Incorporate a use not currently permitted by the Zoning Code and Zoning Map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Incorporate a use, which is incompatible with surrounding land uses because of the difference in the physical scale of development, noise levels, light, glare, traffic levels, or hours of operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Result in an increase in density beyond that permitted in the General Plan and Zoning Code?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Fail to meet the Rolling Hills Estates allowable development standards, or neighborhood compatibility standards in a substantial manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a. The project represents redevelopment in a commercial district that would not divide any residential neighborhood. The property is subject to the Mixed Use Overlay Designation, which encourages the introduction of residential uses adjacent to or above commercial space. The plan as proposed meets this requirement. No significant impact would occur as a result of the proposed project.

b. The existing Zoning Ordinance regulates all development in the City by designating areas where specific land uses are allowed, as well as the standards that must be observed in the construction and operation of these uses. The applicant proposes to construct a three-story structure with a height of 44 feet in an area designated by the General Plan as a Commercial General (CG)/Mixed Use Overlay District. This is consistent with Section 17.30.050(F) of the City's Zoning Code, which sets a maximum height limit of 44 feet and three stories in this district.

The Zoning Code for this district, Section 17.37.040(F) requires that parking for senior housing is provided at one space per unit, plus three spaces per every four units must be set aside as guest and employee parking. Based upon this code, 72 parking spaces are required for the senior housing.

A parking analysis was prepared to determine the adequacy of proposed parking for the senior housing project and to determine the number of parking spaces required for the existing administrative and medical office building. Please refer to **Appendix C** for a copy of the trip generation and parking analysis prepared for the project by Linscott, Law & Greenspan (LLG).

The parking analysis prepared for the project determined that a minimum of 39 spaces would be needed for the senior housing. This is based upon a ratio of 0.95 spaces per dwelling unit. This ratio was determined based upon a comparison of the recommended "design" parking ratio of senior housing uses from other sources and jurisdictions.

According to Section 17.30.050 (G) of the City's Zoning Code, a parking code ratio of 1.0 space per 200 square feet is required for uses located within the C-G District. Applying these recommended parking ratios to the project's current mix of tenants (29,315 square feet) results in a parking requirement of 147 spaces. The existing property currently provides 155 spaces, 8 more than are currently required.

In total, the existing code requires 219 (72 + 147) parking spaces for the property. According to the traffic study/parking assessment prepared for the project, 161 (39 + 122) spaces are necessary for the project. The project proposes 163 spaces. Of these, 111 spaces would be for the office building, 41 spaces would be for the senior condominiums, and 11 spaces would be shared. The amount of parking proposed is below code requirements by a total of 56 (219 – 163), but meets the parking demand anticipated by the traffic study prepared for the project. Based on the parking determinations made by the traffic engineer, the reduction of the parking requirements at the project site would not result in a significant impact. However, approval of a variance is required in order to reduce the City parking standards.

The applicant is requesting a variance to allow the parking spaces to be sized according to the "universal" parking standard. The City of Rolling Hills Estates, in Section of the City's Zoning Code currently requires an off-street parking design standard of 9 feet wide by 20 feet deep. The "universal" parking standard is 8 feet 6 inches wide by 18 feet deep.

According to the parking analysis prepared for the project, based on the current parking industry's current Parking Design Vehicle, which is based on the 85th percentile size, (6 feet 3 inches wide by 16 feet 9 inches long), and surveys conducted by LLG, which indicates that 98.3

percent of all vehicle models are 18 feet or less in length, a "universal" parking space size of 8 feet 6 inches wide by 18 feet long is justified for use in design of the proposed project site. The long-term/low-turnover parking characteristics of an office and active senior condominiums further justify the implementation of the "universal" parking stall dimension. Based on the above, no significant impact would occur from the use of a universal parking space size.

There are also several regional environmental plans applicable to the City, including the Regional Comprehensive Plan, the Congestion Management Plan, and the Air Quality Management Plan. The applicability of these plans is discussed under their respective issue areas (i.e., **Air Quality, Traffic**, etc.)

b. There are no applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans on or in the vicinity of the project site. As a result, no impacts are anticipated under this category.

d.,h. Developed uses in the area contain a mix of architectural styles and building materials. There is no unifying architectural theme present along Deep Valley Drive. The Type S concrete tile roof and stucco building exterior of the proposed project would be similar to other structures located along this corridor. The proposed senior housing living facility would not be incompatible with adjacent uses, all of which are commercial retail or office uses. Adjacent structures are multi-story and similar in overall mass and bulk to that proposed by the applicant.

e.-g.,i.,j. Under the C-G designation, a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of three times the area of the site (expressed as 3:1) is permitted. Lot A is 64,982 square feet (1.5 acres) and would contain a 29,3155-square-foot office structure. This represents a FAR of 0.45. Lot B is 81,288 (1.86 acres) and contains 43,766 square feet of residential units. This represents a FAR of 0.53. No amendment to the General Plan and Zoning Code are required as the existing development is within the allowable FAR for the Commercial-General District.

The Zoning Code for the Mixed Use Overlay (Section 17.37.040 (C)) requires at least 300 square feet of usable outdoor open space per dwelling unit. Lot B will provide 13,306 square feet, 324 square feet per unit of open space.

The Zoning Code for the Mixed Use Overlay (Section 17.37.040 (E)) requires that maximum coverage of a lot by buildings not exceed 35 percent of the total lot area. Lot B is 81,288 square feet and will have a building area of 21,906 square feet for lot coverage of 27 percent. Lot A is 64,982 square feet and will have a building area of 19,663 square feet for lot coverage of 30 percent. The project is in conformance with this section of the Zoning Code.

The project site is located within the commercial core, which represents the most intensive level of development found in the City. The site is designated Commercial General (C-G) by the City Zoning Map and General Plan Map. This designation permits retail commercial uses and residential development. The maximum permitted density of residential development within a Mixed Use Overlay District is set at 22 dwelling units to the acre pursuant to Section 17.37.040 of the Zoning Code. The project applicant proposes to construct 41 units on the 1.85-acre property, which represents a density of 22 dwelling units per acre. The project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning Code requirements for density.

Further Study Required:

No further study is required.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Potentially Significant Unless	Less than Significant	No
--	-------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------	----

	Impact	Mitigated	Impact	Impact
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?	<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"/>

Documentation:

a.,b. 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. In fact, the subject property lies within an area classified as MRZ-1, according to Exhibit 5-4 contained in the Conservation Element of the General Plan. This is an area with no significant mineral deposits. As a result, no impacts upon mineral resources are anticipated.

Further Study Required:

No further analysis is required regarding mineral resources.

XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Generation of construction and/or operational noise levels in excess of Zoning Code requirements (Chapter 8.32)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

Background

When assessing community reaction to noise, it is necessary to establish a scale that averages varying noise exposure over time and to quantify the result in terms of a single number descriptor. Several scales have been developed which address community noise levels. Those that are applicable to this analysis are the Equivalent Noise Level (L_{eq}) and the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL). L_{eq} is the average A-weighted sound level measured over a given time interval. L_{eq} can be measured over any time period, but is typically measured for 1-minute, 15-minute, 1-hour, or 24-hour periods. CNEL is another average A-weighted sound level measured over a 24-hour time period. However, this noise scale is adjusted to account for some individuals' increased sensitivity to noise levels during the evening and nighttime hours. A CNEL noise measurement is obtained after adding 5 decibels—dB(A)—to sound levels occurring during the evening from 7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M., and 10 decibels to sound levels occurring during the nighttime from 10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M. The 5 and 10 decibel penalties are applied to account for people's increased noise sensitivity during the evening and nighttime hours. For example, the logarithmic effect of these additions is that a 60 dB(A) 24-hour L_{eq} would result in a CNEL measurement of 66.7 dB(A).

Noise sources occur in two forms: (1) point sources, such as stationary equipment or individual motor vehicles; and (2) line sources, such as a roadway with a large number of mobile point sources (motor vehicles). Sound generated by a stationary point source typically diminishes (attenuates) at a rate of 6 dB(A) for each doubling of distance from the source to the receptor at acoustically "hard" sites, and it attenuates at a rate of 7.5 dB(A) at acoustically "soft" sites. For example, a 60 dB(A) noise level measured at 50 feet from a point source at an acoustically hard site would be 54 dB(A) at 100 feet from the source, and it would be 48 dB(A) at 200 feet from the source. Sound generated by a line source typically attenuates (i.e., becomes less) at a rate of 3 dB(A) and 4.5 dB(A) per doubling of distance from the source to the receptor for hard and soft sites, respectively.

a.,c.,g. The site is located in a commercial environment and experiences noise associated with vehicle traffic traveling along Deep Valley Drive, Silver Spur Road and Crenshaw Boulevard and human activity and presence in the nearby office and retail buildings. There are no sensitive land uses located immediately adjacent to the site. To the north of the site is a well developed shopping center. This center fronts on Silver Spur Road, with the rear facing Deep Valley Drive. To the east is a large three-story 42-foot tall medical building with a two-story parking structure. To the west is the parking lot ramp and parking structure for the U.S. Post Office building. Crenshaw Boulevard, a major thoroughfare, is adjacent to the rear of the property.

Construction Impacts

Construction activity associated with the project involves use of heavy equipment to demolish the on-site surface parking areas and haul the debris to an off-site disposal facility. Project construction activities involve three phases: demolition, excavation and grading, and construction. In total, the project will take approximately 12 months to complete.

The State of California Community Noise Control Ordinance, published by the California Department of Health Services (DOHS) provides guidelines on determining the compatibility of various land uses in areas subject to particular noise levels. For intermittent, short-term construction operations involving mobile equipment, the DOHS guidelines recommend restricting operations to the weekday hours of 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M. Furthermore, where technically and economically feasible, the DOHS guidelines recommend that the maximum exterior noise levels generated by mobile construction equipment should not exceed 75 dB(A) at the edge of the sensitive property line where a sensitive use is present.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has compiled data regarding the noise-generating characteristics of specific types of construction equipment. Based on this data, noise levels generated by heavy equipment can range from approximately 68 dB(A) to in excess of 100 dB (A) when measured at 50 feet. However, no noise sensitive land uses with a direct line-of-site to the project site exist in the subject area. The nearest occupied structure is the medical office building located approximately 40 feet east of the proposed residential building. Noise levels at this location could reach as high as 100 dB(A) during some portion of construction activity absent mitigation. Such construction noise levels are periodic and temporary in nature, occurring only during daytime hours when people are less sensitive. Based on the above, temporary construction impacts would not be considered significant with implementation of required mitigation.

Project construction will also require the use of heavy trucks to haul equipment and materials to the site, as well as transport debris and earth excavated for construction of the building. To limit noise impacts associated with construction traffic on nearby land uses, truck haul routes have been established which route vehicles away from adjacent uses to the maximum extent feasible. The haul route will use Deep Valley Drive and Silver Spur Road to reach Crenshaw Boulevard, where they would turn north on Crenshaw Boulevard. All vehicles will be staged either within the property lines or at designated areas as established by a City approved haul route plan.

A total of 45 heavy-duty truck trips are necessary to export material off the project site. The number of truck trips traveling along the haul route will vary daily, depending on the nature of the construction activity. Employment of all feasible noise attenuation devices and techniques may be capable of reducing noise levels for stationary equipment to some degree, but trucks and other mobile equipment cannot be surrounded by noise barriers at all locations. As previously discussed, the haul route has been selected to avoid noise sensitive receptors to the extent feasible. In addition, construction noise associated with hauling of material is periodic and short-term in nature, restricted to daytime hours, and is similar in character to existing vehicle noise, so no significant off-site construction noise impacts are expected along local roadways.

Operational Impacts

The proposed development will involve uses and activities that are not expected to generate significant increases in ambient noise levels over the long term. Existing uses on the site generate noise from vehicle traffic and people talking and working. The proposed senior housing facility does not contain any manufacturing or industrial operation that would subject nearby properties to excessive noise or vibration associated with heavy machinery and equipment. Rather, noises generated by the future project would be similar in nature to those presently generated on site. Motor vehicle traffic traveling to and from the facility, people talking, and the occasional delivery vehicle all would contribute to future noise levels.

As described later in response to checklist item **XV.**, the number of vehicle trips generated by

the project would not significantly increase the volume of trips presently traveling along the roadway network. Therefore, traffic noise generated by the proposed project would not significantly increase ambient noise levels and would not contribute to a discernable increase in noise levels experienced along off-site roadways. Based on the above, project operation is not anticipated to exceed the code standards during operation with respect to vehicle noise.

Davy & Associates, Inc. monitored environmental noise levels along the northern building line of the project site on November 20, 2003 between 4:30 PM and 5:00 PM. The measured peak hour L_{eq} monitored at the site was 56.3 dB(A). The estimated exterior CNEL for the site, as calculated using the monitored L_{eq} , was determined to be 57.3 dB(A) for the present year and 58.2 dB(A) by 2013. The California Administrative Code (Title 24), as enforced by the City of Rolling Hills Estates, specifies maximum allowable interior noise levels of CNEL 45 dB(A) for all habitable spaces in residential buildings where exterior noise from transportation sources exceed CNEL 60 dB(A).

With an exterior noise level of CNEL 58.2 dB(A), the building must provide a noise level reduction value of at least 13.2 dB(A) to achieve the 45 dB(A) interior threshold. Standard construction consisting of 2x4 studs with R-11 insulation, exterior stucco, interior gypsumboard, and standard glazing provides a minimum noise reduction of 20 dB(A). Therefore, the building will comply with California Noise Insulation Standards as enforced by the City of Rolling Hills Estates and no significant impacts are anticipated.

b. The primary vibration source during construction activity involves the potential use of pile drivers during foundation construction. Project construction is expected to pre-drill the soil and cast-in place, so no pile driving would occur. Given the above, no impacts are expected.

d. Section 8.32 of the Municipal Code relates to temporary or periodic noise sources that occur in and around the community. The City uses the standards in Section 8.32 to determine when temporary or periodic noise sources constitute a public nuisance. The following standards are applicable to this noise assessment.

"08.32.050 Noise Standards – Exterior

A. The following exterior noise levels [shown in **Table 3**], unless otherwise specifically indicated, shall apply to all receptor properties within a designated noise zone and shall constitute the ambient noise level for the purpose of establishing standards:

Table 3
Exterior Noise Standards

Noise Zone	Designated Noise Zone Land Use	Time Interval	Exterior Noise Level (dB (A))
I	Residential and Agricultural	7:00 AM to 10:00 PM	55
		10:00 PM to 7:00 AM	45
II	Commercial Properties	7:00 AM to 10:00 PM	65
		10:00 PM to 7:00 AM	55
III	Industrial-Quarry Properties	7:00 AM to 10:00 PM	75
		10:00 PM to 7:00	45

Source: City of Rolling Hills Estates Municipal Code Section 8.32.050 Noise Standards – Exterior.

B. Unless otherwise herein provided, no person shall operate or cause to be operated any source of sound at any location within the City, or allow the creation of any noise on property owned, leased, occupied or otherwise controlled by such person which causes the noise level when measured on any other property to exceed the following standards.

1. 'Standard No. 1' means the applicable ambient noise level as set forth in subsection A of this section plus five dB(A) for a cumulative period of no more than twenty minutes in any hour.
2. 'Standard No. 2' means the applicable ambient noise level as set forth in subsection A of this section plus ten dB(A) for a cumulative period of no more than ten minutes in any hour.
3. 'Standard No. 3' means the applicable ambient noise level as set forth in subsection A of this section plus fifteen dB(A) for a cumulative period of more than 1 minute in any hour."

As the project site is located in the Mixed Use Overlay Zone, which permits residential uses, the site is located in Noise Zone I. Exterior Noise Levels in areas located in Noise Zone I are allowed noise levels up to 55 dB(A) from 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM and 45 dB(A) from 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM. However, it should be noted that Section 8.32 does not include standards for a mixed use residential/commercial project or area.

Parking Lot Noise

Nearby parking lot structures represent one type of periodic noise source. Typical noises occurring in a parking structure include doors shutting, engines starting, car acceleration, and parking lot cleaning and other maintenance activities. Other noises can include tire squeal noise (depending on the material used for ramps and parking surfaces), and car alarms. Parking garages can generate L_{eq} noise levels of between 49 dB(A) L_{eq} (tire squeals) to 74 dB(A) L_{eq} (car alarms) at 50 feet. These noise levels would intensify at a rate of approximately 6 dB(A) per doubling of distance. Since the closest exterior balcony on the western portion of the project site is located approximately 35 feet from the existing multi-story parking structure, noise levels experienced at this location could reach as high as 77.1 dB(A) when a car alarm goes off. However, such noise would be periodic and temporary, and balconies, by nature, are used only intermittently. Furthermore, the use of standard construction consisting of 2x4 studs with R-11 insulation, exterior stucco, interior gypsumboard, climate control features, and standard glazing would provide a minimum noise reduction of 20 dB(A) in the interior of the unit. Thus, no significant impacts are anticipated.

Loading Dock Noise

Located to the north of the project across Deep Valley Drive is the Bristol Farms loading docks. Based on field measurements, this facility is located approximately 85 feet from the proposed senior apartments. In general, loading docks do not generate steady state noise levels that occur over a long period of time. Noises generated at loading docks are generally a result of delivery trucks idling, and the unloading and loading of products at the site. Typical operations at loading docks result in noise levels of between 64 to 66 dB(A) at 75 feet. At a distance of 85 feet loading dock noise will reach levels of between 62.9 to 64.9 dB(A) based on a 6.0 dB(A) attenuation per doubling distance for balconies on the northern portion of the site. However, such noise would be periodic and temporary in nature, and balconies, by nature, are used only intermittently. Furthermore, the use of standard construction, as mentioned previously, would provide a minimum noise reduction of 20 dB(A) inside of the unit. Thus, no significant impacts

are anticipated.

e.,f. The property is not located within the bounds of an airport land use plan. The closest airport is the Torrance Airport, which is located approximately 2 miles from the site. The site is not within the flight path of the airport and no significant noise impacts associated with routine aircraft overflights are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures

NO-1. All construction activity shall be limited to between the hours of 7:00 AM to 7:00 PM and should not occur on Sundays.

NO-2. Contractor shall prohibit off-site heavy truck activities in local residential areas as well as establish City approved haul routes.

NO-3. Contractor shall ensure that construction equipment is fitted with modern sound-reduction equipment.

Further Study Required:

No further study is necessary.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a. In 1990, the City had a population of 7,789, according to the 1990 Census. According to the most recent U.S. Census data, the City's population as of the year 2000 was 7,676 persons. According to the California Department of Finance population information, the current population of the City has gradually increased to 8,050 people as of 2003. The relatively stable population may be attributed to the decrease in household size, a reflection of an aging population and households with children who are leaving home.

With the City almost completely urbanized, there have been very few new developments in recent years. A number of parcels have been redeveloped, and newer single-family homes have replaced older single-family houses. Expansion of individual units is the most common form of building activity. Recent major residential developments in the City include the redevelopment

of the Northrop property and a second residential development along Highridge Road, both of which are located in the southwestern section of the City.

The applicant is proposing to construct a 41-unit senior apartment facility on land presently designated for Commercial-General use. A Mixed Use Overlay District also applies to the subject property, which limits the density of residential development to 22 du/acre. The applicant is proposing approximately 22 du/acre, which is consistent with the population forecast at buildout of the General Plan. Demographic forecasts are very important in regional planning efforts to improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion, and plan for the growth of the region. For example, as discussed under the response to checklist item **III.**, the Air Quality Management Plan assumes that general development projects will be constructed in accordance with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) population growth projections published in its Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide. These demographic forecasts are based upon the projections at the local level using General Plan land use data.

b.,c. The existing use on site is surface parking, zoned for Commercial-General use. The proposed project will be constructed within the existing surface parking area. No housing units are located within the project site. As a result, no existing housing will be displaced, and no replacement housing will be required.

Further Study Required:

No further study is required.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. 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:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a.i. 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. The first response station is the Los Angeles County Fire Station #106, located at 413 Indian Peak Road at the end of Crossfield Avenue.

The project site is located within an existing response beat and existing on-site uses are afforded emergency medical and fire protection services. The proposed project will involve the construction of an additional structure on the property. As with all new development, the proposed structure must employ fire prevention and suppression measures required by the Los Angeles County Fire Department. Moreover, the department will review all building plans in subsequent phases of planning and design to ensure that regulations and requirements will be adhered to. As a result, the impacts upon fire protection services are expected to be less than significant.

a.ii. 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. This station serves a population of 75,000 and covers a geographical area of 23 square miles. Lomita Station provides contract services to four contract cities (Rolling Hills Estates, Rolling Hills, Rancho Palos Verdes, and Lomita) and two small unincorporated County areas. The project vicinity is serviced by three to five patrol cars, depending on the time of day. The contract for Sheriff's services in that immediate area is usually one radio car per shift with additional cars that could be used, if needed. This station employs 90 officers. The emergency response time averages 5 minutes or less. The Sheriff's Department also provides canine services, an arson-explosives unit, hazardous materials unit, an aero bureau, and an emergency operations bureau. The station is open year-round and is staffed 24 hours each day to provide protection to the community.

The project is typical of residential, developments throughout California and is not considered to be an exceptional generator of calls for service. In general, the types and number of calls for service would be consistent with those presently occurring in the area. The types of equipment and personnel commonly found at a Sheriff substation can handle such calls without adverse impacting their existing service obligations. The Sheriff's Department was contacted and indicated that they anticipate the senior apartment facility would generate one additional call for service each month, and that there is adequate police protection available for the proposed project. Consequently, no significant impacts are expected.

a.iii. The project would increase the housing stock within the City, but is not expected to contribute new students requiring education given that the occupants are seniors who are beyond childbearing age. While the project is intended to provide housing to senior citizens and, therefore, would not generate a student population, the project would be required to comply with state law related to school facilities. State law provides mitigation for the impact of development approvals on schools. The State School Facilities Act, as revised with adoption of Senate Bill (SB) 50, declared that financing of school facilities and the mitigation of impacts of land use approvals on the need for school facilities are matters of statewide concern. Enacting of SB 50 and Proposition 1A provided a comprehensive school facilities financing and reform program by, among other methods, authorizing a \$9.2 billion school facilities bond issue, school construction cost containment provisions, and an eight-year suspension of the Mira, Hart, and Murrieta court cases that previously guided mitigation of school impacts.

School districts are authorized to levy school impact fees that are set by the State Allocation Board and tiered to allow districts to impose increasingly higher fees if certain criteria are met. The level 1 fee for residential uses presently stands at \$2.05 per square foot and \$0.33 per square foot of commercial construction. According to Government Code Section 65996, the development fees imposed are deemed to be full and complete school facilities mitigation.

a.iv. See responses to checklist item **XIV**. No significant impacts will occur.

a.v. The proposed project will not involve an increased demand on public services beyond that typically required for similar uses. No significant demand for library services or other services is expected with the proposed project.

Further Study Required:

No further analysis is required regarding public services.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 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"/>
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 and/or (iii) the replacement of privately owned public recreational facility as defined by the General Plan with non-recreational facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 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"/>

Documentation:

a.–e. The City owns and maintains a number of parks and recreation facilities covering approximately 177.7 acres of the City. Approximately 52.5 acres of improved parkland is contained within the seven City parks, while the remainder contains a tennis club, stables, botanic garden and open space. In addition, the City contains a number of private recreational facilities such as golf courses, riding clubs and tennis clubs

The City contained a resident population of 8,050 persons, based on the year 2003 California Department of Finance data, that is served by the 52.5 acres of existing parkland. This equates to a park to people ratio of 6.52 acres per 1,000 residents, which is above the City standard for parkland of 4 acres per 1,000 population.

The project would construct 41 dwelling units. Assuming 1 occupant for each 1-bedroom unit and 2 occupants for each 2-bedroom unit proposed on site, the maximum resident capacity of the site would be 75 people. Buildout of the facility would increase the City resident population to approximately 8,125 persons. With buildout of the project, the ratio of improved parkland to the resident population is 6.46 acres per 1,000 persons, which is still above the desired ratio of improved parkland listed by the General Plan as 4 acres per 1,000 persons.

The proposed project would include development of a senior recreation trail on the slope to the

rear of the property. This trail would be constructed of decomposed granite, and would contain tables and chairs at the terminus. The trail would be reserved for residents and their guests. Given the above, no significant impact is anticipated.

Further Study Required:

No further analysis is required regarding recreation.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Incorporate a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections, tight turning radii from streets, limited roadway visibility, short merging lanes, uneven road grades, pedestrian, bicycle or equestrian safety concerns) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) or traffic volumes that may cause traffic hazards or any other conditions determined by the City Traffic Engineer to be a hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Result in inadequate parking capacity as determined by the City in evaluating the demands of the specific project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Result in roadway improvements which will result in a substantial decrease of natural open space, or a net loss of mature trees?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Result in roadway improvements not consistent with the surrounding landscape?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Result in the installation of a traffic signal that is not justified by signal warrants or documented roadway hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

k. Trigger one or more signal warrants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
l. Result in the installation of a traffic signal in a residential neighborhood?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
m. Result in additional access points on arterial streets as defined by the General Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
n. Result in a secondary access point?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
o. Create a flag lot adjacent to an arterial street, as defined by the General Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
p. Create one or more access points on a roadway that is not the primary frontage?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. (continued) <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
q. Traffic from the proposed project itself, or when cumulatively considered, degrade traffic flow at an intersection operating at Level of Service "C" or better (without the project) below Level of Service "C"?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
r. Traffic from the proposed project itself, or when cumulatively considered, degrade traffic flow at an intersection operating at Level of Service "D" or worse (without the project)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
s. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load or capacity of the street system?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a.,b.,k.,q.–s. A trip generation and parking analysis for the proposed project was prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan (LLG) in February 2004, while a traffic impact analysis needs assessment was prepared by LLG in March 2003. These reports are summarized below and contained in their entirety in **Appendix C**.

The project takes access off Deep Valley Drive, which is designated as a local collector by the Transportation and Circulation Element of the Rolling Hills Estates General Plan. A standard local collector roadway has a right of way of 40 feet, which contains a paved roadway of two travel lanes with an eight-foot landscape parkway on each side. Deep Valley Drive provides connection to Crenshaw Boulevard and Hawthorne Boulevard via Silver Spur Lane. The intersection of Palos Verdes Drive North with Crenshaw Boulevard presently operates below accepted levels of service in the weekday peak commute hours.

At project buildout, the proposed senior housing facility is expected to generate 169 daily vehicle trips (one half arriving, one half departing) with 10 (5 inbound, 5 outbound) AM peak hour trips and 16 (8 inbound, 8 outbound) P.M. peak hour trips. The volume of peak hour vehicle trips that would reach the intersection of Palos Verdes Drive North with Crenshaw Boulevard is minimal (i.e., less than 16 trips) and would not be sufficient to individually or

cumulatively cause a substantial increase in the volume to capacity ratio of this intersection. Moreover, the project will not exceed the 50 peak hour trips threshold established by the *2002 Congestion Management Program (CMP) for Los Angeles County*, so a CMP Traffic Analysis Report is not required. Based on the above, the project would not impact a road operating below the accepted level of service standards for either the City or Congestion Management Plan roadway network and no traffic signals are warranted or proposed.

c. The proposed project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns or increase traffic levels that would result in a substantial safety risk. The project does not propose any structures that will impede a height limitation within close proximity to an airport; therefore, no foreseeable impact on air traffic patterns would occur as a result of this project.

d.,e.,h.,i.,m.–p. An existing network of regional and local roadways serves the project area. The project design eliminates one of the access driveways currently serving Lot A. A driveway entrance proposed on Deep Valley Road will serve Lot B. Both driveways will provide ingress and egress. Neither change will result in a significant impact on the configuration of the existing roadway system and landscaped frontage required to serve the project. As a result, there will be less than significant impacts under this category.

f. The Zoning Code for this district, Section 17.37.040(F) requires that parking for senior housing is provided at one space per unit, plus three spaces per every four units must be set aside as guest and employee parking. Based upon this code, 72 parking spaces are required for the senior housing.

A parking analysis was prepared to determine the adequacy of proposed parking for the senior housing project and to determine the number of parking spaces required for the existing administrative and medical office building. Please refer to **Appendix C** for a copy of the trip generation and parking analysis prepared for the project by Linscott, Law & Greenspan (LLG).

The parking analysis prepared for the project determined that a minimum of 39 spaces would be needed for the senior housing. This is based upon a ratio of 0.95 spaces per dwelling unit. This ratio was determined based upon a comparison of the recommended "design" parking ratio of senior housing uses from other sources and jurisdictions.

According to Section 17.30.050 (G) of the City's Zoning Code, a parking code ratio of 1.0 space per 200 square feet is required for uses located within the C-G District. Applying these recommended parking ratios to the project's current mix of tenants (29,315 square feet) results in a parking requirement of 147 spaces. The existing property currently provides 155 spaces, 8 more than are currently required.

In total, the existing code requires 219 (72 + 147) parking spaces for the property. According to the traffic study/parking assessment prepared for the project, 161 (39 + 122) spaces are necessary for the project. The project proposes 163 spaces. Of these, 111 spaces would be for the office building, 41 spaces would be for the senior condominiums, and 11 spaces would be shared. The amount of parking proposed is below code requirements by a total of 56 (219 – 163), but meets the parking demand anticipated by the traffic study prepared for the project. Based on the parking determinations made by the traffic engineer, the reduction of the parking requirements at the project site would not result in a significant impact. However, approval of a variance is required in order to reduce the City parking standards.

The applicant is requesting a variance to allow the parking spaces to be sized according to the "universal" parking standard. The City of Rolling Hills Estates, in Section of the City's Zoning Code currently requires an off-street parking design standard of 9 feet wide by 20 feet deep. The "universal" parking standard is 8 feet 6 inches wide by 18 feet deep.

According to the parking analysis prepared for the project, based on the current parking industry's current Parking Design Vehicle, which is based on the 85th percentile size, (6 feet 3 inches wide by 16 feet 9 inches long), and surveys conducted by LLG, which indicates that 98.3 percent of all vehicle models are 18 feet or less in length, a "universal" parking space size of 8 feet 6 inches wide by 18 feet long is justified for use in design of the proposed project site. The long-term/low-turnover parking characteristics of an office and active senior condominiums further justify the implementation of the "universal" parking stall dimension. Based on the above, no significant impact would occur from the use of a universal parking space size.

g. There are 10 miles of designated bikeways along major roads in the City. These bikeways inter- connect with those of adjacent cities to form an integrated system throughout the peninsula. Construction of the proposed project will not impact any of the existing crosswalks or bike trails in the City. The potential design changes to area roadways will largely be limited to curb cuts. As a result, construction and subsequent operation of the proposed project will not result in any significant adverse impacts upon pedestrians or bicyclists.

Further, the project is supportive of alternative forms of transportation because the resident's would predominantly rely on a shuttle operated by the facility for transportation due to the age of the occupants. Placement of the residential facility near existing commercial uses is also supportive of the City's efforts to encourage pedestrian activity.

j.,l. The project does not include a proposal to install a traffic signal so no impacts under this category are anticipated.

Further Study Required:

No further study is required with respect to transportation/traffic.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?				
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

Documentation:

a.,b.,e. The County Sanitation Districts maintains and operates the sewer system in the city. 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. The JWPCP has a design capacity of 350 million gallons per day (mgd) and currently treats 321 mgd, for an excess capacity of approximately 29 mgd.

The project is required to make any necessary upgrades to the wastewater collection and treatment system by providing relief for existing lines nearing capacity that would be affected by project development. The project applicant will also pay sewage connection fees based on the number of plumbing fixtures associated with the project. Based on the above, no significant impact will occur as a result of project development.

c. 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. Since the site is currently developed, existing storm drain infrastructure would accommodate project runoff with minor improvements. As a result, the impacts upon storm water drainage facilities are anticipated to be less than significant.

d. Water service in the City is provided by the California Water Service Company (CWSC), which purchases water from the MWD. MWD imports this water from the Colorado River, which is then stored at the Palos Verdes Reservoir. The capacity of the reservoir is approximately 358.4 million gallons of water. The average water consumption in the City is approximately 1.2 million gallons per day. According to staff of the CWSC, there is an adequate supply of water to serve buildout of the City's General Plan. In addition, the CWSC has indicated that the CWSC is prepared to provide potable water service to the proposed project in accordance with the rates, rules, and regulations in effect and on file with the California Public Utilities Commission, or as modified in the exercise of its jurisdiction.

The project applicant will not increase the residential development intensity above that currently allowed in the General Plan. Therefore, no further study is needed to address the issue of water supply and demand at buildout of the City with the proposed project.

f. Currently, much of the solid waste collected within the City by private haulers is disposed of within Los Angeles County. However, solid waste has become a commodity and has supported the growth of the private solid waste handling industry. In this free-enterprise system, private industries now compete to collect and dispose of solid waste. Private solid waste haulers dispose of their loads at landfills that provide the greatest economic advantage (considering location, transportation cost, and disposal tipping fees).

The project would generate solid waste during its construction and operational stages of development. The types of waste generated by the project include food waste, cardboard and

plastic packaging material as well as cans, bottles and paper products. Where the solid wastes are disposed of and economics and adopted City of Rolling Hills Estates and state regulations drive how they are recycled. Furthermore, the amount of solid waste entering landfills versus the amount generated would be based on a number of variables, including market demand for recyclables.

It is noted that each individual 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 nature of the project (i.e., senior housing with centralized kitchen and common areas) would be especially conducive to recycling due to the ease of collection and disposal of recyclable materials. The City has been successful in its recycling efforts to date. Given the above, no significant impact is anticipated.

g. The proposed project will be required to comply with the waste reduction and/or recycling City-initiated programs pursuant to AB 939 requirements. The proposed project will generate certain types of waste that will be sorted at the PRRF. Any residual waste will then be disposed of at area landfills. Browning Ferris Industries of North America, Inc., (BFI) has indicated that BFI would be able to service the project for temporary construction and for permanent trash service when completed. No unique types of waste will be generated by the proposed project, and as a result, the impacts upon solid waste are expected to be less than significant.

Further Study Required:

No further study is required with respect to utilities and public services.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Documentation:

a.-c. Based on the preceding discussion, the proposed project would neither degrade the quality of the environment nor affect any Endangered fauna or flora. The proposed project would result in minor impacts in the issue areas of agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, air quality, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, recreation, and utilities and service systems. However, these impacts are not considered significant, due to project-incorporated mitigation measures and/or the project's compliance with required City codes/ordinances or other required regulation/conditions.