

## **D. 102-UNIT DENSITY BONUS ALTERNATIVE**

Under the 102-Unit Density Bonus Alternative (Alternative D), the project would incorporate a density bonus of 25 percent over the proposed project's planned development. The design concept would be similar to the proposed 82-unit concept, however Alternative D would exceed the 45-foot height limit. Alternative D would include 51 townhouse units and 51 apartment flats. Similar to the proposed project, access to the townhouse units would be provided by an upper surface road. Access to the apartment flats would be via a subterranean parking structure. As with the proposed project, Alternative D would require 30,000 cubic yards (cy) of cut, 5,000 cy of fill, the export of 100,000 cy, and the import of 75,000 cy for landslide repair. The on-site portion of the Revello Landslide would be permanently stabilized and repaired as part of the development for Alternative D.

### ***Visual Resources***

Alternative D increases the overall size and height of the proposed project. The 45-foot height limit for the project site would be exceeded by Alternative D, resulting in greater impacts related to the obstruction of private views. Therefore, aesthetics impacts associated with Alternative D would be greater than the aesthetics impacts associated with the proposed project.

### ***Air Quality***

Short-term air quality impacts during grading and construction would be greater under this alternative because while this alternative requires the same amount of grading on the project site, it would require more overall construction of residential uses. Long-term operational air quality impacts from stationary emissions would be greater under this alternative compared to the proposed project. This is because Alternative D involves 25 percent more residential units, resulting in more natural gas and electricity consumption and associated air pollution than the proposed project. Also, this alternative would generate more vehicle trips per day than the proposed project, meaning that long-term automobile-related air pollutant emissions would be greater than the proposed project.

### ***Geology and Soils***

The amount of grading associated with slope stabilization required for Alternative D would be same compared to the proposed project. Therefore, grading impacts under Alternative D would be similar compared to the proposed project. The project site would still be subject to seismic shaking impacts. While more people would be exposed to such seismic hazards under Alternative D, compliance with the UBC and recommendations included in the geotechnical reports would ensure that no significant seismicity impacts are created under this alternative. Geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative D would similar compared to the proposed project.

### ***Hydrology and Water Quality***

Alternative D contains more residential units than the proposed project and, therefore, may involve a greater amount of impermeable surfaces (e.g., roads and buildings) on the project site. The minor increase in impermeable surfaces on the project site would cause an increase in runoff rates and velocities compared to the proposed project. Therefore, surface hydrology impacts from Alternative D would be slightly greater than those associated with the proposed project. Water quality impacts associated with Alternative D would be similar to those associated with the proposed project due to mandatory compliance with the Los Angeles County Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan.

### ***Land Use***

Similar to the proposed project land uses, the land uses associated with Alternative D are consistent General Plan land use designations for the project site. However, Alternative D would not be consistent with the height limits for the designated zoning because it would exceed the 45-foot height limit. In addition, Alternative D would exceed the density that is currently permitted on the project site. Because this alternative involves 20 more units than the proposed project, land use impacts relative to compatibility, zoning and land use plan designation consistency would be greater under this alternative compared to the proposed project.

### ***Noise***

Under Alternative D, short-term noise impacts during grading and construction would be greater compared to the proposed project because, while this alternative requires the same amount of grading on the project site, it would require more overall construction of residential uses. In addition, Alternative D would generate more vehicle trips per day than the proposed project; thus, long-term automobile-related noise impacts would also be greater than the proposed project.

### ***Population and Housing***

Alternative D would consist of more residential units compared to the proposed project. As such, this alternative would result in more on-site residents compared to the project. However, Alternative D would provide an increase in housing and provide affordable units. Therefore, housing impacts would be less under Alternative D compared to the proposed project.

### ***Police Protection***

There would be a greater demand for police service under this alternative because of the overall increased density associated with Alternative D. The number of dwelling units would increase, as would the number of residents, increasing the demand for police services compared to the proposed

project. Therefore, Alternative D would have more of an impact on police services than the proposed project.

### ***Fire Protection***

Compared to the proposed project, Alternative D would result in an increase in demand for fire protection and emergency services provided by the LAFD. This is because Alternative D involves more units (and associated residential population) than the proposed project. As a result, fire protection impacts from Alternative D would be greater than those associated with the proposed project.

### ***Schools***

Compared to the proposed project, Alternative D would generate more students that would attend schools administered by the LAUSD. As a result, the impacts on schools would increase under this alternative compared to the proposed project.

### ***Recreation/Parks***

Alternative D would create more of a demand for parks and recreational services because the number of residents would increase compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts on parks and recreation associated with this alternative would be greater than those of the proposed project.

### ***Road Maintenance***

Compared to the proposed project, Alternative D would have the similar impacts on road maintenance. This is because the project would require the same amount of grading, which includes construction vehicles and haul trucks. Therefore, impacts on road maintenance associated with this alternative would be similar to those of the proposed project.

### ***Traffic***

Alternative D would generate more average daily vehicle trips because it involves more units than the proposed project. As such, traffic impacts to local roadway segments and intersections would be greater under this alternative compared to the proposed project.

### ***Sewer***

Alternative D would generate approximately 21,930 gallons of sewage per day (Table VI-11). Conversely, the proposed project would generate approximately 17,150 gallons of sewage per day. Daily sewage generation associated with Alternative D would therefore be 4,780 gallons per day more

than the proposed project because there would be more residential units. As a result, sewer impacts created by Alternative D would be greater than those associated with the proposed project.

**Table VI-11  
Alternative D Sewage Generation**

Land Use	Size (du)	Generation Rate (gallons/day/du) <sup>a</sup>	Total (gallons/day)
Multi-Family Residential (Townhomes)	51 du	230/du	11,730
Multi-Family Residential (Flats)	51 du	200/du	10,200
<b>Total Sewage Generation</b>			<b>21,930</b>
<sup>a</sup> Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, March 2002.			

### **Water**

As shown in Table VI-12, Alternative D would consume approximately 26,316 gallons of water per day. The proposed project would result in the consumption of approximately 20,580 gallons of water per day. Thus, Alternative D would result in 5,736 gallons more daily water consumption than the proposed project. This is because Alternative D involves more residential units (and associated residential population) than the proposed project. Therefore, water impacts from Alternative D would be greater than those of the proposed project.

**Table VI-12  
Alternative D Water Consumption**

Land Use	Size (du)	Generation Rate (gallons/day/du) <sup>a</sup>	Total (gallons/day)
Multi-Family Residential (Townhomes)	51 du	276/du	14,076
Multi-Family Residential (Flats)	51 du	240/du	12,240
<b>Total Water Consumption</b>			<b>26,316</b>
<sup>a</sup> Source: City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, March 2002.			

### **Solid Waste**

Alternative D would result in the daily generation of approximately 3,570 pounds of solid waste per day (Table VI-13). The proposed project would result in the daily generation of approximately 2,870 pounds of solid waste per day. As such, daily solid waste generation associated with Alternative D would be 700 pounds per week more than those associated with the proposed project due to more

dwelling units. Therefore, solid waste impacts from Alternative D would be greater than the proposed project.

**Table VI-13  
Alternative D Solid Waste Generation**

Land Use	Size (du)	Generation Rate (pounds/week/du) <sup>a*</sup>	Total (pounds/week)
Multi-Family Residential (townhomes and flats)	102 du	35	3,570
<b>Total Solid Waste Generation</b>			<b>3,570</b>
<sup>a</sup> Source: Santa Monica Environmental and Public Works Management, 1995.			
* These rates are recognized by the City of Los Angeles.			

**Electricity**

Alternative D would result in the daily consumption of approximately 1,572 kilowatt hours (Table VI-14), whereas the proposed project would consume approximately 1,264 kilowatt hours per day. Alternative D would require 308 kilowatt hours more electricity each day compared to the proposed project. This is because Alternative D involves more residential units than the proposed project. Therefore, the electricity impacts associated with Alternative D would be greater than those related to the proposed project.

**Table VI-14  
Alternative D Electricity Consumption**

Land Use	Size (du)	Generation Rate (kilowatt hours/unit/year) <sup>a</sup>	Total (kilowatt hours/day)
Multi-Family Residential (Townhomes and Flats)	102 du	5,626.50	1,572
<b>Total Estimated Electricity Consumption per day</b>			<b>1,572</b>
<sup>a</sup> Source: SCAQMD CEQA Handbook, 1993.			

**Natural Gas**

As shown in Table VI-15, Alternative D would consume approximately 13,639 cubic feet of natural gas per day. The proposed project would consume approximately 10,965 cubic feet of natural gas per day. As such, Alternative D would require 2,674 cubic feet more natural gas each day compared to the proposed project. This is because Alternative D involves more homes than the proposed project. Therefore, the natural gas impacts associated with Alternative D would be greater than those related to the proposed project.

**Table VI-15**  
**Alternative D Natural Gas Consumption**

<b>Land Use</b>	<b>Size (du)</b>	<b>Consumption Rate (cubic feet/unit/month)<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Total (cubic feet/day)</b>
Multi-Family Residential (Townhomes and flats)	102 du	4,011.5	13,639
<i>Total Estimated Natural Gas Consumption per day</i>			<b>13,639</b>
<sup>a</sup> Source: SCAQMD CEQA Handbook, 1993.			