

E. CHANGE IN SITE PLAN: NEW CONSTRUCTION LIMITED TO DEVELOPED PORTION OF SITE

Under this alternative the southern 21.8 acres of the site would not be developed. This alternative is intended to eliminate the aesthetic impact of development on the southern 21.8 acres. The additional retirement and medical services would be provided within the existing developed portion of the site.

This would necessitate the redevelopment of most of the northern portion of the site with a series of four and five story buildings. This would require a complicated phasing schedule, which could result in missing the 2008 deadline for meeting the requirements of SB 1953. Furthermore, the ultimate site 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, which is the same as the Proposed Project, would come late in the construction schedule due to the need to redesign the existing campus to accommodate the additional square footage.

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

1. Grading

Due to the elimination of development on the southern 21.8 acres of the site, grading would be reduced substantially. Similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would not cause a significant impact on grading, but would reduce the less than significant impacts as compared to 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

Although grading quantities would be reduced, required demolition activities would be greatly increases as a result, construction of this alternatives would still be anticipated to have a short-term impact on local air quality due to dust 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. However, it should be noted that the occasional dust impacts from the agricultural activities on the southern portion of the site could still occur with this alternative. As a result, this alternative could potentially generate greater amounts of PM_{10} than are anticipated under the Proposed Project. However, as with the Proposed Project, this alternative would not result in a significant air quality impact.

4. Hydrology

Impacts on surface water runoff would be reduced as compared to the Proposed Project, since the development would not add a substantial amount of impervious surface to the site. So, similar to the Proposed Project, this alternatives would not cause a significant impact on hydrology, but would reduce the less than significant impacts as compared to the Proposed Project.

5. Biota

Impacts on biota would be reduced as compared to the Proposed Project, since no new activity or development would occur on the southern 21.8 acres of the site. Similar to the Proposed Project, this alternative would not cause a significant impact on biota, but would reduce the less than significant impacts, as compared to the Proposed Project.

6. Noise

Although grading quantities would be reduced, required demolition activities would be greatly increases as a result, construction of this alternatives would still be anticipated to have a short-term impact on noise levels at surround sensitive receptor. However, it should be noted that the number of sensitive receptor impacted would be limited to those adjacent to the norther portion of the site. 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. These significant impacts would be reduced, as compared to the Proposed Project.

This alternative is anticipated to generate similar daily vehicle trips as the Proposed Project. So, 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. However, as with the Proposed Project these increases would be less than significant.

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, this alternative 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 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 generate 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 impacts as those of the Proposed Project.

12. Parking

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 anticipate to allow a publicly accessible trail as 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 268.

23. Solid Waste

As with the Proposed Project, development of this alternative would contribute to the ultimate depletion of local landfills. Unlike the Proposed Project, construction would generate a substantial amount of demolition debris. Although, the exact quantity can not be determined it is anticipated that the amounts generated by this alternative would be less than a significant impact. Operation of this alternative would generate a net increase of approximately 2,094 pounds of solid waste per day;

approximately 709 pounds more than the Proposed Project, due to the continued agricultural activities on the site. As mandated by the California Integrated Waste Management Act, at least fifty percent maintenance waste should be diverted from landfills. Therefore, after diversion, approximately 1,047 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

Unlike the Proposed Project, development of the alternative would not alter the visual character of the existing undeveloped portion of the site, thus eliminating the significantly impact to the current views looking at the southern portion of the site from Mulholland Drive. However, it should be noted that the height and prominence of development on the norther portion of the site would increase. This would increase impacts to views from the Park Sarrento and Calabasas Road. These impacts would be adverse but less than significant. 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 biota impacts and the prominence of development on the southern portion of the site. However, the decrease in prominence would be partially off-set by an increase in the prominence of development on the northern portion of the site. As a result, aesthetic impacts would change but not necessarily be eliminated. The disadvantages of this alternative would be a slight increase in water and energy consumption, operational air emissions, and solid waste and sewage generation due to the anticipated continued agricultural activity on the site. Furthermore, construction noise emissions, solid waste and traffic would be anticipated to increase due to the extensive demolition required to redevelop the site.