

A. NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

As required by CEQA, this subsection analyzes a “No Project” Alternative (Alternative A). Under Alternative A, the proposed project would not be constructed and the project site would remain in its current condition. Two apartment buildings (consisting of a total of 20 dwelling units) known as the Ocean Woods Terrace apartments would remain on the site. In addition, the project site contains a portion of the Revello Landslide. Over the years, additional movement of the original slide mass and secondary failures has caused the slide to enlarge and affect Revello Drive and 17321 Castellammare Drive. The analysis of Alternative A assumes the continuation of existing conditions as well as development of the related projects described in Section II.B (Related Projects). The potential environmental impacts associated with Alternative A are described below and are compared to the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.

Visual Resources

Since no new construction would take place under Alternative A, visual resource impacts would be less than the proposed project. This is because, unlike the proposed project, Alternative A does not involve the grading and construction of 82 new multi-family units. Therefore, visual resources impacts under the No Project Alternative would be less than the proposed project.

Air Quality

No grading or construction would be required under Alternative A and no new vehicle trips would be generated. No air pollutant emissions (i.e., PM₁₀, CO, NO_x) related to grading, construction or automobiles would be generated under this alternative. Therefore, air quality impacts from Alternative A would be less than the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Since no grading would take place under this alternative, grading impacts would be less than the proposed project. The project site would still be subjected to ground shaking and seismic settlement. However, fewer people would be exposed to such seismic hazards under Alternative A. Therefore, shaking and seismic impacts associated with Alternative A would be less than those associated with the proposed project. However, slope stabilization impacts would be greater under Alternative A, as the existing Revello Landslide area would not be stabilized as is proposed for the project. The existing apartments and surrounding properties would continue to be subject to the earth movements resulting from the existing (and moving) slide.

Hydrology and Water Quality

New impermeable surfaces (e.g. buildings and driveways) would not be constructed under this alternative and thus no increase in surface water runoff rates or velocities would occur. Therefore surface hydrology and water quality impacts associated with Alternative A would be less compared to the proposed project.

Land Use

The existing land uses on the project site are permitted under the project site's current zoning (RD2-1 zone) and land use category designated in the Brentwood-Pacific Palisades District Community Plan. The proposed project would also be permitted within the site's zoning and land use designations. Therefore, land use impacts relative to zoning and land use plan designation consistency would be similar under this alternative compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Alternative A would not involve any grading or construction. Therefore, no noise impacts that are typically associated with grading and construction would occur from this alternative. Likewise, since no new development or associated traffic would occur under Alternative A, there would be no increase in noise levels typically associated with the long-term operation of new development projects. As such, noise impacts from Alternative A would be less than the proposed project.

Population and Housing

Alternative A would not involve any new development or housing and therefore would not change the existing population on the project site or in the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, population and housing impacts from Alternative A would be less than the proposed project.

Police Protection

There would be no need for increased police service with Alternative A because there would be no new development on the project site. The law enforcement and protection services provided by the Los Angeles Police Department would not be affected, since there would be no new development on the project site. Therefore, police protection impacts under Alternative A would be less than the proposed project.

Fire Protection

Alternative A would not result in an increase for the demand of fire protection and emergency services provided by the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) because no new development would occur. Therefore, fire protection impacts from this alternative would be less than the proposed project.

Schools

Under Alternative A, public schools would not be impacted because no new development would occur on-site and thus no new students would be generated. Therefore, schools would be less affected under Alternative A compared to the proposed project. However, no new school fees would be generated for the Los Angeles Unified School District.

Recreation/Parks

Compared to the proposed project, Alternative A would have less of an impact on the demand for parks and recreation service since no new residents would be introduced into the project area. The proposed project consists of 82 multi-family residential units. Residential developments typically have the greatest demand for parks and recreation facilities since they generate a permanent increase in the residential population. Therefore, impacts on parks and recreation associated with this alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.

Road Maintenance

Compared to the proposed project, Alternative A would have less of an impact on road maintenance since no new construction would occur. There would be no increase of haul trucks in the project area. Therefore, impacts on road maintenance associated with this alternative would be less than those of the proposed project.

Traffic

Alternative A is not forecast to generate any new trips at the project sites, as compared to 348 daily trips for the proposed project. Alternative A would not generate new trips during the morning and afternoon peak hours, as compared to the proposed project's 26 and 32 trips during those hours, respectively. Therefore, traffic impacts under this alternative would be less than the proposed project.

Sewer

Alternative A would not generate any sewage because no new development would occur on the project site. As a result, Alternative A would result in less sewage impacts compared to the proposed project.

Water

Alternative A would not include any new development on the project site, and thus would not increase the demand for water service. Therefore, water impacts of Alternative A would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

Solid Waste

Under Alternative A, there would be no increase in solid waste generation, as no new development would be permitted on the project site. Therefore, solid waste impacts from Alternative A would be less than those associated with the proposed project.

Electricity

There would be no increase in electricity consumption under Alternative A because no new development would occur. Consequently, electricity impacts from Alternative A would be less than those related to the proposed project.

Natural Gas

There would be no increase in natural gas consumption under Alternative A because no new development would occur. Consequently, natural gas impacts from Alternative A would be less than those related to the proposed project.