

D. CHANGE IN SITE PLAN: REDUCED HEIGHT ON SOUTHERN PORTION OF SITE

Under this alternative the height of development would be limited to 2 stories and 30 feet, similar to the limitations expressed for residential development in the Community Plan and under the 1XL height limit of the existing zoning. The net increase of 139,500 square feet of medical use, 252,070 square feet of residential use, 45,040 square feet of service/administration use, and 21,000 square feet of activity/recreational uses would be the same as the Proposed Project. This alternative is intended to reduce the visible intensity of development on the southern 21.8 acres. To accomplish this, it is necessary to increase the number and footprint size of each of the assisted living villas proposed for the southern portion of the site. Under this alternative, 15 villas (as opposed to 10 for the project), containing an average of 18 assisted living units each (as opposed to an average of 27 for the project), would be developed. Each of these villas would be 2, rather than 3, stories in height.

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

1. Grading

Due to the increased footprint of development, virtually the entire 21.8 acres of the site would be graded. Although retention of the open space of Dry Canyon Creek for a nature preserve is anticipated to still be able to be accomplished, this alternative is anticipated to result in the elimination of both the man-made mound and natural knoll on the site. This alternative would not cause erosion but could be considered to significantly alter landforms, therefore it would cause a new significant impact not caused by the Proposed Project.

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. The primary source of air emissions from project operation would be from vehicle trips. This alternative would generate the same number of vehicle trips as the Proposed Project. As a result, as with the Proposed Project, this alternative would not generate a significant air quality impact.

4. Hydrology

This alternative would result in an approximately 30 percent increase in impervious surfaces from the Proposed Project. This increase would not result in an exceedance of the capacity of the 39 inch drain. 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 not result in an impact to any federally- or state-listed endangered, threatened, or sensitive plant or wildlife species. However, the grading may result in greater impacts to the onsite oak trees. Although, with mitigation, these impacts may be reduced to less than significant levels, this alternative would result in a impact to biota greater than the Proposed Project.

6. Noise

Although this alternative would require slightly more extensive on-site grading for the installation of five additional building foundations and to provide utilities and internal circulation to these

buildings, the construction noise levels under this alternative are anticipated to be similar to those found under the Proposed Project. As a result this alternative would be anticipated to result in significant construction noise impacts that could be reduced, but not eliminated, by mitigation measures.

This alternative is anticipated to generate similar daily vehicle trips to the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, this alternative would contribute to a significant cumulative impact in traffic related noise impacts for some surrounding sensitive receptors.

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

As with the Proposed Project the development on-site requires a Conditional Use Permit and Zone variance. With approval of these discretionary approvals this alternative would have the same less than significant impact to zoning as the Proposed Project.

9. Community Plan

As with the Proposed Project, the development of this alternative would require a Conditional Use Permit and Zone variance. With approval of these discretionary approvals this alternative would have the same less than significant impact to the Community Plan as 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 could 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

This alternative would generated the same number of new vehicle trips per day as the proposed. The access points to the site would be the same as the Proposed Project. As a result this alternative, would be anticipated to have the same traffic impact as those of the Proposed Project.

12. Parking

As with the Proposed Project, impacts due to parking under this alternative would not be significant.

13. Site Access

This alternative would generated the same number of new vehicle trips per day as the proposed. The access points to the site would be the same as the Proposed Project. As a result this alternative, would be anticipated to have the same site access impacts as those of the Proposed Project.

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. 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, development of this alternative would adversely impact police services. The increase of residents and employees on the site would increase the demand for police services in the area. Furthermore, project-generated traffic could adversely affect emergency access by contributing to traffic congestion. Proposed mitigation measures would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

16. Schools

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

17. Parks and Recreation

As with the Proposed Project, this alternative is anticipated to create publicly accessible trail, which is required to meet the General Plan. Therefore, as with the Proposed Project, this alternative would have a less than significant impact on the Public Recreation Plan.

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

Development under this alternative would be anticipated to consume the same amount of electricity, and natural gas annually as the Proposed Project. Both this alternative and Proposed Project would result in an increase in the consumption of non-renewable resources. As with the Proposed Project, this amount of energy consumption would be considered less than significant.

20. Water

Development under this alternative would be anticipated to consume the same amount of water as the Proposed Project. As a result, as with the Proposed Project, this amount of water consumption would be considered less than significant.

21. Sanitary Sewers

Development under this alternative would generate the same amount of sewage as the Proposed Project. As with the Proposed Project, this amount of wastewater, is less than what would be considered significant. With the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, these impacts would be further reduced.

22. Storm Water Drainage

See *Hydrology*, page 262.

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 1,774 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 887 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 less 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. However, it should be noted that the height limit would reduce, but not eliminate, the number of second story views along Park Sorrento which would now contain development in their foreground views. 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 advantage of this alternative as compared to the Proposed Project would be a decrease the prominence of development as seen from Mulholland Drive. However, this decrease would not result in a change in the level of significance of this impact. The disadvantage of this alternative would be an increase in grading, construction air and noise emissions, and increased biota impacts.