

VII. ALTERNATIVES

The previous DEIR considered seven alternative developments. These alternatives are on file and available for review with the Department of City Planning, Environmental Review Section, 221 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 1500, Los Angeles. A review of the alternatives in the previous environmental documentation was utilized in determining the appropriate range of feasible alternatives for CEQA purposes. Due to the change in intensity and project objectives for development of the proposed hospital facility and retirement community at the project site, it was determined that additional on-site alternatives of various intensities would potentially be feasible in order to attain basic project objectives. A review of potential impacts resulting from the Proposed Project identifies significant impacts to aesthetics. A review of the feasible alternatives, in light of revised objectives and the aforementioned impacts, resulted in the revision of the previously discussed alternatives and the addition of new alternatives, which are described below.

- A. No Project (Build-Out of Entitlements)
- B. Change in Land Use: Existing Zoning
- C. Change in Land Use: Community Plan
- D. Change in Site Plan: Reduced Height on the Southern Portion of Site
- E. Change in Site Plan: New Construction Limited to Developed Portion of Site

A. NO PROJECT (BUILD-OUT OF ENTITLEMENTS)

The no project alternative would result in the build-out of the current entitlements on the site. The current entitlements allow a total of 219,000 square feet of medical use with 299 licensed beds, 337,100 square feet of residential use with 424 residential units, 77,000 square feet of service/administration use, and 64,371 square feet of activity/recreational use. As with the Proposed Project, construction of residential units under this alternative would take place on the southern portion of the site, which is currently undeveloped.

Following is a discussion of the environmental impacts anticipated to be associated with this alternative.

1. Grading

According to the 1984 EIR, the proposed development under this alternative would require the excavation of 16,000 cubic yards of earth and the exportation of 10,000 cubic yards of earth, which is less grading than is required under the Proposed Project. Grading activities would occur in areas across the entire campus, including in the area of the existing man-made mound and natural knoll. As with the Proposed Project, with the implementation of mitigation measures, grading under this alternative would not cause erosion or a significant landform alteration, therefore it would not cause a significant grading impact.

2. Geologic Hazards (Seismicity)

Impacts from seismic hazards would be similar to the Proposed Project, since the development under this alternative would be constructed in the same areas proposed for construction under the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, development within areas of potential liquefaction hazard and ground shaking, in the event of a major earthquake, would result in less than significant impacts after mitigation.

3. Air Quality

Construction of this alternative would have a short-term impact on local air quality due to dust raised during grading operations, and emissions from heavy duty construction equipment and vehicles.

According to the 1984 EIR, daily operation of the project would generate 834 pounds of CO, 78 pounds of ROG, 135 pounds of NO_x, 26 pounds of PM₁₀, and 19 pounds of SO_x. This would be a much greater amount of CO emissions, and a slightly greater amount of all other pollutant emissions than would be generated under the Proposed Project. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, air quality impacts under this alternative would be significant.

4. Hydrology

On-site drainage would be controlled in a manner similar to the Proposed Project. Runoff related to this alternative would be approximately the same as with the Proposed Project. Impacts on surface water runoff would be similar to the Proposed Project, resulting in: no alteration of existing drainage patterns to create greater downstream flooding potential, no alteration of existing drainage patterns so that existing vegetation declines, no exceedance of capacity of bridges and in-place flood control improvements, no imposition of flood hazards on other properties, no uncontrolled runoff resulting in erosion and sedimentation downstream, no imposition of barriers to the free movement of fish and other aquatic resources, and no placement of habitable structures or essential transportation improvements within floodway.

5. Biota

Development under this alternative would result in the conversion of two acres of grassland and 9 acres of cropland. As with the Proposed Project, this development would not result in an impact to any federally- or state-listed endangered, threatened, or sensitive plant or wildlife species. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, this alternative would not result in a significant impact to biota.

6. Noise

The operation of development under this alternative would result in future noise level increases of between 0.1 and 0.3 dB, with the maximum increase only slightly less than under the Proposed Project. Construction noise levels under this alternative would be similar to those found under the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, this alternative would not result in significant operational noise impacts, but it would result in significant construction noise impacts that could be reduced, but not eliminated, by mitigation measures.

7. Artificial Light

The introduction of artificial lighting to the previously undeveloped portion of the project site under this alternative would result in an overall increase in nighttime illumination. Effects would be similar to the Proposed Project, resulting in less than significant impacts.

8. Zoning

Similar to the Proposed Project, development of this alternative would not result in a significant zoning impact due to the existing Conditional Use Permit and Zone Variance.

9. Community Plan

While the proposed expansion of the existing medical and retirement facility under this alternative conforms to the Canoga Park-Winnetka-Woodland Hills-West Hills Community Plan, the potential availability of the residential development as general purpose apartments, rather than for use by non-ambulatory residents, would not be in keeping with the intent of the Community Plan. According to the 1984 EIR, this alternative could cause a potential significant impact to the Community Plan due to the potential to develop residential units available to the general public at densities greater than permitted by the Community Plan. This would be a greater impact than is anticipated under the Proposed Project.

10. General Plan

Scenic Highways

As with the Proposed Project, the development of this alternative would convert existing undeveloped land which is visible from Mulholland Drive Scenic Highway. This change would not have a significant impact on the Scenic Highways Plan.

Equestrian and Hiking Trails

This alternative would provide a public equestrian trail and would therefore be in conformance with the Major Equestrian and Hiking Trails Plan, as is the Proposed Project.

11. Traffic

According to the 1984 EIR, this alternative would generate an estimated 3,534 new vehicle trips per day, which is a reduction of less than 200 daily trips from what the Proposed Project would generate. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, this alternative would not create a significant traffic impact.

12. Parking

Impacts due to parking under this alternative would not be significant.

13. Site Access

This alternative would have a similar access plan to the Proposed Project, with the main entrance located at the central portion of the site along Mulholland Drive. As with the Proposed Project, there would be no significant site access impact under this alternative .

14. Fire Protection

Like the Proposed Project, this alternative would not be considered adequately served based on LAFD hydrant fire-flow requirements and first engine company distance and response time. However, with implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the impact of this alternative on fire protection services, as with the Proposed Project, would be reduced to a less than significant level.

15. Police Protection

As with the Proposed Project, the increased number of residents and employees on the site under this alternative would increase the demand for police services. Furthermore, project-generated traffic could adversely affect emergency access by contributing to traffic congestion. However, as with the Proposed Project, implementation of mitigation measures and the use of private security on-site would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

16. Schools

As with the Proposed Project, with the payment of school development fees to offset any secondary impacts within the attendance area caused by the alternative, the development of this alternative would not result in a significant school impact.

17. Parks and Recreation

As with the Proposed Project, approximately 9 acres of the project site would remain as open space under this alternative. This amount of open space would satisfy the demand for recreation and park services generated by the number of residents on the site under this alternative. The configuration of this alternative would also fulfill the Open Space Plan requirement for preserving the character of this area as desirable open space. Therefore, this alternative would have a less than significant impact on the Public Recreation Plan and the Community Plan, similar to the Proposed Project.

18. Libraries

As with the Proposed Project, the demand for library services due to the development of this alternative would not exceed the expected level of services at the time of the completion of the development. Therefore, this alternative would not cause a significant impact to library services.

19. Energy

According to the 1984 EIR, this alternative would consume a total of approximately 12,144,000 kWh of electricity and 81,239,450 cf of natural gas annually. This would be an increase of 1,832,585 kWh and 46,573,526 cf annually from the amount anticipated under the Proposed Project. Both the alternative and Proposed Project would result in an increase in the consumption of non-renewable resources. However, as with the Proposed Project, this amount of energy consumption would be considered less than significant.

20. Water

According to the 1984 EIR, this alternative would consume a total daily average of approximately 64,218 gallons of water, compared to the estimated average of 99,700 gallons of water per day that would be consumed by the Proposed Project. This amount would not be considered to have a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures would further reduce any potential impacts.

21. Sanitary Sewers

According to the 1984 EIR, this alternative would result in a total estimated daily generation rate of 91,700 gallons of wastewater, compared to the 76,398 gallons of wastewater that is anticipated under the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, this amount would not be considered significant. With the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, these impacts would be further reduced.

22. Storm Water Drainage

See *Hydrology*, page 241.

23. Solid Waste

As with the Proposed Project, development of this alternative would contribute to the ultimate depletion of local landfills. This alternative would generate approximately 3,300 pounds of solid waste per day. As mandated by the California Integrated Waste Management Act, at least fifty percent maintenance waste should be diverted from landfills. Therefore, after diversion, approximately 1,650 pounds of solid waste would reach local landfills daily. The net amount of solid waste to be disposed of would be minimal and should not be considered a significant impact. Recommended mitigation measures would further reduce impacts that would already be less than significant. Solid waste amounts generated by this alternative would be greater than those of the Proposed Project.

24. Aesthetics/View

As with the Proposed Project, development of the alternative would alter the visual character of the existing undeveloped portion of the site, and would significantly impact the current views looking north and west from Mulholland Drive. Implementation of required mitigation measures would reduce, but not eliminate these impacts.

25. Archaeology

No significant archaeological sites have been recorded on the site. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, this alternative would not create a significant impact to archaeology with the implementation of mitigation measures.

26. Conclusion

The advantages of this alternative as compared to the Proposed Project would be a decrease in the amount of grading, operational noise, and traffic generated by the site, and a decrease in the amount of water consumption at the site. However, these decreases do not reflect a change in the level of significance under this alternative, as compared to the Proposed Project. The disadvantage of this alternative would be an increase in daily operational pollutant emissions, energy consumption, and wastewater, and a significant impact to the Community Plan.