

## 6.0 ALTERNATIVES

As required by Section 15126.6 of the *CEQA Guidelines*, this EIR examines alternatives to the proposed project analyzed in this document. Included in this analysis are three alternatives that involve different configurations, sizes and intensity of development on the site, including the CEQA-required “no project” alternative. This section also identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

The following alternatives are evaluated in this EIR:

- *Alternative 1: No Project*
- *Alternative 2: Reduced Project Alternative*
- *Alternative 3: Open Space Preserve Alternative*
- *Alternative 4: Other Institutional Use Alternative*

### 6.1 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

#### 6.1.1 Alternative Description

The No Project Alternative assumes that development of the proposed project would not occur. The site would remain an undeveloped hillside. The site would remain in its current condition and no improvements (including trails) would occur. It should be noted that the No Project alternative would not preclude development of the site in the future.

#### 6.1.2 Impact Analysis

No change in environmental conditions would occur under this alternative because no new development would occur. This alternative would avoid the proposed project’s significant and unavoidable aesthetics impact as it would not change the visual character of the site.

The proposed project’s potentially significant but mitigable aesthetic impacts, such as light and glare, impacts to biological resources related to nesting birds and non-native plant species, geology impacts related to slope stability and expansive soils, traffic impacts related to sight distance at the project entrance, and construction impacts related to air quality, would also be avoided.

Overall, this alternative’s impacts would be less than those of the proposed project in every issue area examined in the EIR. It should be noted, however, that implementation of the No Project alternative at this time would not preclude future development of the project site, nor would it meet the project objectives.



## 6.2 REDUCED PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

### 6.2.1 Alternative Description

This alternative assumes that 12 new senior-restricted (55+ years of age or older) for-sale residential units would be developed on the project site. These units would be located along Crestridge Road and would correspond to units 1 to 12 as shown on the site plan for the proposed project (see Figure 2-4). The design and layout of these units would be similar to that of the proposed project in that they would be townhome-style and single-level living stacked flat residences with two bedrooms and two bathrooms in six different floor plans, ranging from approximately 1,700 square feet to 2,100 square feet. The units would be attached and two stories in height. The architectural style of the residences would be Spanish Colonial. As with the proposed project, the height of several of these units would exceed 16 feet above existing grade (as shown in Figure 2-8); therefore, a conditional use permit would be required. As with the proposed project, access would be provided through the site to the City-owned lands (Vista Del Norte Preserve) to the north. The undeveloped portion of the property would be restored with native vegetation, with pedestrian trails connecting this area of the site to the adjacent preserve.

### 6.2.2 Impact Analysis

**a. Aesthetics.** Under the Reduced Project Alternative, 12 senior housing units would be developed adjacent to Crestridge Road.

As noted in Section 4.1 (*Aesthetics*), the project site is in the general area of a Vista and a View identified in the General Plan. The identified Vista is shown as extending west toward the site from the vicinity of the intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard and Silver Spur Road. The identified View extends to the southwest from this intersection, with the project site theoretically within the western extreme of the viewshed. However, development along Silver Spur Road since the General Plan was adopted has altered the views from that area, completely blocking views toward the project site. Therefore, like the proposed project, this alternative would not result in impacts to the designated Vista or View.

When compared to the proposed project, the reduction in the number of units and limitation of development to along Crestridge Road as part of this alternative would reduce the visibility of development at the site from other public streets in the area.

As noted in Section 4.1, the primary private viewpoints offering views of and over the project site are the residences on the hillsides to the south on such streets as Mistridge Drive, Seaside Heights Drive and Oceanridge Drive. While this alternative would still require grading and modification at the site to accommodate the 12 senior-housing units, it would be incrementally less than what would be required for the proposed project. In addition, while the 12 units would be visible from the residences to the south, they would not be expected to intrude into private views from these residences to the same extent as the proposed project. The proposed project's structures would be located along the lower part of the view frames and would impair a only a small portion of the view of the developed basin, and little if any of the wide mountain views.



In addition, while this alternative would introduce new lighting on the currently undeveloped, unlit project site, the reduction in number of units would incrementally reduce light and glare impacts when compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, adherence to the lighting restrictions in the City's zoning ordinance would be required to ensure that lighting at the site would not be out of character with the site's Institutional zoning or the existing surrounding development.

The Reduced Project Alternative would introduce structural development, new landscaping, and hardscape to an open and undeveloped site. While the intensity of grading required for this alternative would be substantially reduced when compared to the proposed project, alteration of the site's slope and ridgeline topography would likely still be required to accommodate development of this alternative at the project site. As discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the site is identified on the Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan Visual Aspects Map as a "canyon and ridge" feature and as "Undeveloped Lands Impacting Visual Character." Though impacts to the overall ridgeline features at the site would be reduced when compared to the proposed project, grading required for construction of this alternative would be expected to substantially alter both of these attributes by replacing the sloping nature of the lower part of site with flat pads in order to accommodate the residential units, internal roads and other ancillary infrastructure. In addition, the open and undeveloped nature of the site would be irreversibly altered though to a lesser degree than by the proposed project. These changes would be most directly experienced from viewpoints to the south of the site, including Crestridge Road, as well as the residential areas on the north-facing hillsides across Crestridge Road. It is not expected that this alternative would alter the ridgeline as seen from points north and west, including Indian Peak and Silver Spur roads and Hawthorne Boulevard, unlike the proposed project. As with the proposed project, impacts to the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings would be significant and unavoidable.

**b. Air Quality.** Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would include grading and other earthwork activities in close proximity to sensitive receptors, including adjacent residences to the east and west of the site as well as David's School Preschool and Early Childhood Center to the west and the Peninsula Church pre-school to the south. However, the amount of grading and construction and the duration of these activities would be reduced under this alternative when compared to the proposed project, as the number of residential units at the project site would be reduced from 60 to 12. Because the quantity and duration of grading and construction would be reduced, construction emissions would be incrementally reduced under this alternative in comparison to the proposed project. Nevertheless, temporary air quality impacts related to daily NO<sub>x</sub> and particulate emissions during construction may exceed SCAQMD thresholds as well as LST thresholds for particulate emissions, similar to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, mitigation measures AQ-1(a) and AQ-1(b) would be required to reduce potential construction-generated air quality impacts. Also as with the proposed project, implementation of the construction equipment controls required by Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a) and the fugitive dust control measures required under Mitigation Measure AQ-1(b), would be required to reduce temporary construction impacts to a less than significant level.

Transportation emissions would be reduced under this alternative compared to the proposed project since the overall number of new residences would be 12 units compared to the proposed



project's 60 units. In addition, long-term air quality impacts would be incrementally lower since reducing the number of residential units would have fewer emissions associated with energy (electricity and natural gas) and area sources (i.e., landscape maintenance equipment, hearth/ fireplaces, consumer products and architectural coating). Like the proposed project, the emissions associated with vehicle trips and stationary emissions under this alternative would not exceed SCAQMD thresholds and long-term air quality impacts would be less than significant. Furthermore, like the proposed project, impacts related to carbon monoxide concentrations would not be significant and this alternative would not exceed any population projections upon which the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is based. As such, like the proposed project, impacts from this alternative related to carbon monoxide emissions and consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant.

**c. Biological Resources.** Like the proposed project, this alternative would involve residential development on an undeveloped site along Crestridge Road. However, this alternative would result in 48 fewer residential units at the project site compared to the proposed project, and a smaller area of disturbance. As with the proposed project, impacts to sensitive status species would be less than significant given the highly disturbed nature of the site, lack of suitable habitat and high level of human activity already present in the vicinity. Although this alternative would involve less alteration of land and disturbance of vegetation than the proposed project, tree and shrub removal associated with construction activities could affect nesting birds. Like the proposed project, with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3, impacts to nesting birds would be reduced to a less than significant level. In addition, like the proposed project, this alternative would not conflict with local policies related to protecting biological resources and would not conflict with any adopted habitat-related plans. Similar to the proposed project, potential introduction of non-native plant species associated with on-site landscaping could conflict with the adopted Natural Conservation Community Plan and Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would be required.

**d. Geology.** Although there would only be 12 new senior-residential units under this alternative compared to 60 senior-residences under the proposed project, the new structures and people in the project area under this alternative could be exposed to seismically induced groundshaking. Nevertheless, like the proposed project, mandatory compliance with applicable City of Rancho Palos Verdes and CBC requirements would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Because this alternative would only involve development of 12 new senior-residential units along Crestridge Road, the potential to for a landslide to affect the proposed residences would be reduced. While this new development would be located further away from the structural setback line identified for the proposed project (see Figure 2-4), Mitigation Measure GEO-2 would be required to address slope stability issues at the site as the project area is located in an area subject to earthquake-induced landslides. The site is also located in an area subject to expansive soils. Therefore, like the proposed project, Mitigation Measure GEO-3 would be required to reduce impacts related to expansive soils to a less than significant level. Overall, impacts related to geology would be similar to those of the proposed project, but incrementally reduced.



**e. Greenhouse Gasses.** Because this alternative would only involve development of up to 12 residential units, 48 fewer than the proposed project, greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction, transportation, energy, area sources, water use, and solid waste would be incrementally reduced. In addition, like the proposed project, this alternative would be consistent with the GHG reduction strategies set forth by the 2006 CAT Report as well as the 2008 Attorney General's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures. Therefore, like the proposed project, impacts to greenhouse gas emissions under this alternative would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

**f. Hydrology and Water Quality.** Because this alternative would have fewer senior-residential units (12) compared to the proposed project (60 units), this alternative would have incrementally fewer impacts related to water quality during construction activities than the proposed project. However, excavation and grading required for development of the Reduced Project Alternative, like the proposed project, could result in erosion of soils, sedimentation and discharge of various pollutants, which may cause temporary impacts to surface water quality. As with the proposed project, implementation of NPDES requirements would be required for this alternative and would reduce impacts related to water quality during construction activities to a less than significant level.

For operational impacts, the overall amount of impermeable surface under this alternative would be incrementally less than the proposed project since only 12 units would be developed compared to 60 units under the proposed project. In addition, the total amount of new landscaping under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed project, thereby reducing the amount of pollutants such as pesticides and herbicides that could potentially affect surface water quality. It is expected that the landscaping of the undeveloped portion of the site would not require application of pesticides and herbicides. Therefore, this alternative would have incrementally fewer impacts related to surface water quality than the proposed project. As with the proposed project, this alternative would be required to adhere to the Municipal Code requirements related to the NPDES permit. Implementation of the NPDES required SUSMP would reduce impacts that could occur from pollutants onsite or increase in storm flows on or off-site to a less than significant level.

**g. Noise.** Temporary noise and vibration impacts due to construction activities under this alternative would be of similar magnitude but lesser duration than the proposed project due to the reduced number of units to be constructed and the smaller area requiring grading. In addition, fewer sensitive receptors would be exposed to this temporary impact, as construction activities would be limited to the area along Crestridge Road and thus farther from some of the adjacent senior residences and the David's School Preschool and Early Childhood Center. As with the proposed project, temporary noise impacts could exceed 70 dBA at the property line of nearby residences and institutional uses. Like the proposed project, construction noise impacts would be less than significant, however mitigation measures N-1(a) through (g) would still be recommended to further reduce construction noise.

Construction of the Reduced Project Alternative could also generate intermittent levels of groundborne vibration affecting residences and buildings adjacent to the project site. However, these impacts, which would be temporary in nature, would be incrementally less than under the proposed project, due to the reduction in the number of units, and would not exceed existing



thresholds. As with the proposed project, impacts relation to construction vibration would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Long-term traffic-generated noise impacts under this alternative would be incrementally lower than the proposed project as there would be fewer vehicle trips generated under this alternative. As with the proposed project, noise generated by traffic would be less than significant under this alternative and no mitigation would be required.

**h. Transportation and Circulation.** This alternative would only include 12 new residential units within the project area compared to the proposed project which would allow up to 60 new residential units. As such, this alternative would have incrementally fewer overall daily trips and fewer trips in the AM and PM peak period as compared to the proposed project. As with the proposed project, traffic generated by this alternative would not exceed City thresholds for level of service at any intersection nor would it exceed level of service standards for street segments. Therefore, impacts to street segments and intersections would be less than significant. Also similar to the proposed project, traffic generated by this alternative would not affect vehicle storage capacity at intersections near the project site. Therefore, impacts to intersection queuing would be less than significant. As with the proposed project, impacts would be less than significant and mitigation would not be required.

Design of this alternative would be expected to consider issues such as adequate sight distance and internal circulation and access. However, implementation of Mitigation Measure T-5 would be required to ensure that landscaping does not impede sight distance at the driveway to the site, and implementation of Mitigation Measure T-4 would be recommended to further improve site circulation and access.

Because overall vehicle trips would be reduced under this alternative, impacts related to roadway segments, CMP identified freeway monitoring segments and arterial intersections, emergency access, and public transportation policies would be incrementally reduced. Like the proposed project, impacts related to roadway segments, CMP identified freeway monitoring segments and arterial intersections, emergency access, and public transportation policies would be less than significant. In addition, because the number of residential units under this alternative would be reduced from 60 units to 12 units, construction trips would also be reduced under this alternative, thereby incrementally reducing temporary construction traffic. Similar to the proposed project, construction traffic would not result in any significant impacts to key study intersections, and mitigation would not be required.

## **6.3 OPEN SPACE PRESERVE ALTERNATIVE**

### **6.3.1 Alternative Description**

This alternative would involve incorporation of the site into the adjacent Vista Del Norte Ecological Preserve and maintaining the site as open space. Recreational amenities would be added to the site for use by the public, including trails connecting to the existing Vista Del Norte Ecological Preserve, which would replace the existing informal paths used by the public at present. Amenities such as an overlook area with seating would also be added.



This alternative would require a change in the land use designation and zoning for the site from Institutional to Open Space. As part of this alternative, the site could be designated as reserve open space under the Rancho Palos Verdes Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) Subarea Plan. It should be noted that this alternative would not achieve any of the project objectives discussed in Section 2.0 (Project Description).

### **6.3.2 Impact Analysis**

This alternative would prevent future institutional development at the project site; therefore, no change in environmental conditions would occur. This alternative would avoid the proposed project's Class I, significant and unavoidable, aesthetics impact as it would not change the visual character of the site.

The proposed project's potentially significant, but mitigable aesthetic impacts, such as light and glare, impacts to biological resources related to nesting birds and non-native plant species, geology impacts related to slope stability and expansive soils, traffic impacts related to sight distance at the project entrance, and construction impacts related to air quality, would also be avoided. In fact this alternative would be expected to result in beneficial impacts to recreation, aesthetics and biological resources by expanding the area of preserved open space in what is an otherwise built out area of the City.

Overall, this alternative's impacts would be less than those of the proposed project in every issue area examined in the EIR as future development at the site would be precluded. This alternative could involve a General Plan amendment and Zoning Ordinance amendment to accommodate the change from Institutional to Open Space.

## **6.4 OTHER INSTITUTIONAL USE**

### **6.4.1 Alternative Description**

This alternative would involve development of an approximately 18,000 square foot, single-story (16 feet maximum height) building, or strip of buildings depending on the use or uses at the site, directly adjacent to Crestridge Road. The remainder of the site would be left in its current undeveloped state. Due to the Institutional Zoning designation of the property, other uses that could be accommodated by this type of development include, but are not limited to: minor professional and retail commercial uses, clinics and sanitariums (such as an animal hospital), educational uses and places used primarily for religious services, including parochial schools and convents.

Grading at the site would be limited to only what is required to accommodate the building and the supporting infrastructure; retaining walls would be constructed at the rear of the structure to limit the amount of alteration required to the slopes north of Crestridge Road. No on-site parking would be provided as part of this alternative; therefore, all workers and visitors to the site would be required to use on-street parking.

This alternative would not include provision for a pedestrian link to the adjacent Vista Del Norte Preserve.



## 6.4.2 Impact Analysis

**a. Aesthetics.** Under the Other Institutional Use Alternative, a single-story structure would be developed directly adjacent to Crestridge Road.

As discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the project site is in the general area of a Vista and a View from the area of the intersection of Crenshaw Boulevard and Silver Spur Road. However, development along Silver Spur Road since the General Plan was adopted has altered the views from that area completely blocking views toward the project site. Therefore, like the proposed project, this alternative would not result in impacts to the designated Vista or View.

When compared to the proposed project, the reduction in height of this alternative and restriction of development directly adjacent to Crestridge Road would reduce the visibility of development at the site from most public streets in the area.

As noted in Section 4.1, the primary private viewpoints offering views of and over the project site are the residences on the hillsides to the south on such streets as Mistridge Drive, Seaside Heights Drive and Oceanridge Drive. While this alternative would still require some grading and modification at the site directly adjacent to Crestridge Road, it would be substantially less than what would be required for the proposed project. In addition, while the front façade and roof of the single-story building would be visible from the residences to the south, it would not intrude into private views of the area beyond the existing ridgeline as it would be lower than the highest point at the site. As with the proposed project, impacts to private views would be less than significant.

In addition, while this alternative would introduce new lighting on the currently undeveloped, unlit project site, the reduction in size of the development would incrementally reduce light and glare impacts when compared to the proposed project. Given the types of uses allowed in the Institutional zone, nighttime lighting would be expected to be minimal. As with the proposed project, adherence to the lighting restrictions in the City's zoning ordinance would be required to ensure that lighting at the site would not be out of character with the site's Institutional zoning or the existing surrounding development, thereby ensuring impacts are less than significant.

The Other Institutional Use Alternative would introduce structural development and hardscape to an open and undeveloped site. The intensity of grading required for this alternative would be substantially reduced when compared to the proposed project and alteration of the site's overall slope and ridgeline topography would likely not be required to accommodate development of this alternative at the project site. As discussed in Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*, the site is identified on the Rancho Palos Verdes General Plan Visual Aspects Map as a "canyon and ridge" feature and as "Undeveloped Lands Impacting Visual Character." Impacts to the overall ridgeline features at the site would be avoided under this alternative as grading would be confined to the area directly adjacent to Crestridge Road and be limited to only what is required to accommodate the building and supporting infrastructure. In addition, the open and undeveloped nature of the site would be, for the most part, maintained. Unlike the proposed project, this alternative would not alter the ridgeline as seen from points north and west, including Indian Peak and Silver Spur roads and Hawthorne Boulevard. Therefore, impacts to





the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings would be less than significant.

**b. Air Quality.** Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would include grading and other earthwork activities in close proximity to sensitive receptors, including adjacent residences to the east and west of the site as well as the Peninsula Church pre-school to the south. No grading would be undertaken in the vicinity of the David's School Preschool and Early Childhood Center. The amount of grading and construction and the duration of these activities would be reduced under this alternative when compared to the proposed project, given the smaller building footprint to be accommodated. Because the quantity and duration of grading and construction would be reduced, construction emissions would be incrementally reduced in comparison to the proposed project. Nevertheless, temporary air quality impacts related to daily NO<sub>x</sub> and particulate emissions during construction may exceed SCAQMD thresholds as well as LST thresholds for particulate emissions, similar to the proposed project. Mitigation measures AQ-1(a) and AQ-1(b) would likely be required, or at least recommended, to reduce potential construction-generated air quality impacts. Also, the construction equipment controls required by Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a) and the fugitive dust control measures required under Mitigation Measure AQ-1(b), could be required to reduce temporary construction impacts to a less than significant level.

Depending on the type of institutional use(s) associated with this alternative, long-term traffic-generated air quality impacts could be incrementally higher than the proposed project if the institutional use(s) selected for the site generates higher levels of vehicle trips. Due to the modest size of development under this alternative, however, mobile-source emissions would not be substantially greater than those of the proposed project. Emissions associated with energy use (electricity and natural gas) and areas sources (i.e. landscape maintenance equipment, consumer products and architectural coating) would be expected to be lower under this alternative given the reduced size of the development footprint and lower amount of building square footage. Operational emissions would therefore be generally similar to those of the proposed project, and would be less than significant with no mitigation required.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would not exceed any population projections upon which the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) is based. As such, like the proposed project, impacts from this alternative related to consistency with the AQMP would be less than significant.

**c. Biological Resources.** This alternative would involve institutional development on a portion of an undeveloped site along Crestridge Road. This alternative would result in a substantially reduced development footprint when compared to the proposed project, and as such a smaller area of disturbance. As with the proposed project, impacts to sensitive status species would be less than significant given the highly disturbed nature of the site, lack of suitable habitat and high level of human activity already present in the vicinity. Although this alternative would involve less alteration of land and disturbance of vegetation than the proposed project, tree and shrub removal associated with construction activities could affect nesting birds. Like the proposed project, with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3, impacts to nesting birds would be reduced to a less than significant level. In addition, like the proposed project, this alternative would not conflict with local policies related to protecting



biological resources and would not conflict with any adopted habitat-related plans. Similar to the proposed project, potential introduction of non-native plant species associated with on-site landscaping could conflict with the adopted Natural Conservation Community Plan and Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would be required.

**d. Geology.** Although there would only be one single-story building at the site under this alternative, compared to 60 senior-residences under the proposed project, the new structure and people in the project area could be exposed to seismically induced groundshaking. Nevertheless, like the proposed project, mandatory compliance with applicable City of Rancho Palos Verdes and CBC requirements would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

Because this alternative would involve development of a single-story building along Crestridge Road, the potential for a landslide to affect this alternative would be reduced. While this new development would be located away from the known landslide areas to the north of the site and the structural setback line identified for the proposed project (see Figure 2-4), Mitigation Measures GEO-2(a), (b) and (c) would be required for this alternative to address potential slope stability issues at the site. Also, expansive soils are known to be present at the project site and there is the potential for these to be encountered in the area adjacent to Crestridge Road. Therefore, Mitigation Measure GEO-3 would be required to reduce impacts related to expansive soils to a less than significant level. Overall, impacts related to geology would be lower than for the proposed project.

**e. Greenhouse Gasses.** Because this alternative would involve development of one single-story building, greenhouse gas emissions associated with construction, energy, area sources, water use, and solid waste would be expected to be incrementally reduced when compared to the proposed project. However, depending on whether the institutional use(s) at the site generate higher levels of vehicle trips than the proposed project's residential uses, there is the potential for greenhouse gas emissions to be incrementally greater than the proposed project. Although greenhouse gas emissions could potentially be slightly higher, emissions would not be expected to exceed established thresholds, and would be less than significant as with the proposed project.

Like the proposed project, this alternative would be expected to be potentially consistent with the GHG reduction strategies set forth by the 2006 CAT Report as well as the 2008 Attorney General's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Measures. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

**f. Hydrology and Water Quality.** Because this alternative would have a substantially reduced development footprint compared to the proposed project (60 senior-residential units spread throughout the site), this alternative would have incrementally fewer impacts related to water quality during construction activities than the proposed project. However, excavation and grading required for development of the Other Institutional Use Alternative, like the proposed project, could result in erosion of soils, sedimentation and discharge of various pollutants, which may cause temporary impacts to surface water quality. As with the proposed project, implementation of NPDES requirements would be required for this alternative and would reduce impacts related to water quality during construction activities to a less than significant level.



For operational impacts, the overall amount of impermeable surface under this alternative would be incrementally less than the proposed project since development would be confined to the area directly adjacent to Crestridge Road. In addition, the total amount of new landscaping under this alternative would be reduced compared to the proposed project, thereby reducing the amount of pollutants such as pesticides and herbicides that could potentially affect surface water quality. No landscaping of the undeveloped portion of the site would be undertaken. Therefore, this alternative would have incrementally fewer impacts related to surface water quality than the proposed project. Like the proposed project, this alternative would be required to adhere to water quality requirements related to the NPDES permit. Implementation of the related required best management practices would reduce impacts that could occur from pollutants onsite or increase in storm flows on or off-site to a less than significant level.

**g. Noise.** Temporary noise and vibration impacts due to construction activities under this alternative would be of similar magnitude but lesser duration than the proposed project due to the smaller area requiring grading and reduced amount of building construction. In addition, fewer sensitive receptors would be exposed to this temporary impact, as construction activities would be limited to the area directly adjacent to Crestridge Road and thus farther from some of the adjacent senior residences and the David's School Preschool and Early Childhood Center. As with the proposed project, temporary noise impacts could exceed 70 dBA at the property line of nearby residences and institutional uses. Like the proposed project, construction noise impacts would be less than significant, however mitigation measures N-1(a) through (g) would still be recommended to further reduce construction noise.

Construction of the Other Institutional Use Alternative could also generate intermittent levels of groundborne vibration affecting residences and buildings adjacent to the project site. However, these impacts, which would be temporary in nature, would be incrementally less than under the proposed project, due to the reduction development footprint, and would not exceed existing thresholds. As with the proposed project, impacts relation to construction vibration would be less than significant and no mitigation would be required.

Long-term traffic-generated noise impacts under this alternative could be incrementally higher than the proposed project depending on whether the institutional use(s) at the site generate higher levels of vehicle trips under this alternative. If the increase in noise levels exceeds 1 dB then impacts would significant and mitigation would be required.

**h. Transportation and Circulation.** This alternative would include an approximately 18,000 square-foot single-story building accommodating an institutional use or uses directly adjacent to Crestridge Road. Possible uses at the site include minor professional and retail commercial uses (such as small offices for bookkeeping, consulting, management and mail order or small businesses that create or assemble a product for sale off-site), a clinic use or a parochial school. This is compared to the proposed project which would allow up to 60 new residential units throughout the project site.

Depending on the use or uses present, this alternative could generate between about 12 trips per thousand square feet (ksf) and 31 trips per ksf each day for an approximate daily trip generation of between 208 trips (single tenant office) and 566 trips (clinic), based on the ITE Trip Generation Manual (8<sup>th</sup> Edition). This is compared to the proposed project's trip generation rate



of 8.00 trips per unit per day, which equates to 480 trips per day to and from the site. As shown, depending on the institutional use(s) selected, trip generation at the site could be slightly higher or lower than the proposed project.

As discussed in Section 4.8, *Traffic and Circulation*, existing traffic levels along the roadway network in the vicinity of the project site are low and are projected to remain low under the Year 2015 cumulative traffic scenario. Therefore, given the limited amount of development square footage that could be accommodated in a single-story building directly adjacent to Crestridge Road and the uses that would be allowed at the site, traffic generated by institutional uses at the site would be expected to remain below City thresholds for level of service at any intersection or level of service standards for street segments. Similarly, impacts to street segments and intersections as well as impacts to vehicle storage capacity would be expected to be less than significant.

Design of this alternative would be expected to consider issues such as adequate sight distance and access. Mitigation measures may be required to ensure adequate sight distance was provided.

Impacts related to roadway segments, CMP identified freeway monitoring segments and arterial intersections, emergency access, and public transportation policies would be dependent on the type of institutional use present at the site. Like the proposed project, impacts related to roadway segments, CMP identified freeway monitoring segments and arterial intersections, emergency access, and public transportation policies would be expected to be similar to the proposed project and less than significant.

Finally, the development footprint and size of the structure to be constructed would be reduced when compared to the proposed project; therefore, construction trips would also be reduced, incrementally reducing temporary construction traffic. Similar to the proposed project, construction traffic would not result in any significant impacts to key study intersections, and mitigation would not be required.

## 6.5 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED, BUT REJECTED

As required by Section 15126.6 (c) of the *CEQA Guidelines*, this subsection identifies those alternatives that were considered but rejected by the lead agency because they either were considered infeasible or could not avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. Three alternatives were considered that were rejected. Each is listed below along with a brief description and reason for being rejected.

- *Rejected Alternative 1, Low Density Residential: This alternative would include low density, single-family residential development spread throughout the project site. Grading would be limited to that required to achieve grade for the driveways and benching into the slope for the houses. This alternative was rejected because it would not avoid the significant unavoidable impact resulting from conflicts with the General Plan visual resource designations for the site due to the change in visual character of the site. In addition, the extent of the grading required to accommodate even a few houses spread throughout the site would be expected to be reduced, but not substantially, due to the topography of the site. Finally, the development*



*of single-family residences would not be compatible with the existing Institutional land use designation at the project site.*

- *Rejected Alternative 2, Increased Grading: This alternative would involve further grading of the hillside from what has been planned for the proposed project, in order to reduce the potential for structures to project above the height of the existing ridgeline. This alternative was rejected as it would not avoid any of the Class I, significant and unavoidable, and Class II, significant but mitigable, impacts identified for the proposed project. This alternative could marginally reduce the already less than significant impacts to views from the surrounding viewpoints when compared to the proposed project. However, it would also result in increased secondary impacts related to construction traffic, air quality, noise and visual character, which would be greater than for the proposed project.*
- *Rejected Alternative 3, Alternate Development Site: This alternative would involve development of the proposed senior-housing project on an alternate site to that currently proposed. Development in Rancho Palos Verdes is constrained by the steep sloping topography in many areas of the City as well as the built-out nature of land that would be suitable for development. A review of the City's zoning map and the existing vacant parcels in the area shows the number of vacant sites in the City that have institutional or residential zoning that would allow development of the proposed project is limited, and no other suitable sites in the city are owned or controlled by the project applicant. Therefore, this alternative was rejected given the limited number of suitable sites for development of the proposed project available in Rancho Palos Verdes.*

## 6.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table 6-1 compares the impacts for each of the alternatives to the impacts of the anticipated onsite development.

The Open Space Preserve Alternative would be the overall environmentally superior alternative as it would avoid the proposed project's significant and unavoidable impacts to visual character and also the significant but mitigable impacts to aesthetics, biological resources, geology, traffic and circulation and air quality. While this alternative would require a change to the site's Zoning and General Plan designations, it would preclude future development at the site, unlike the No Project Alternative. It should be noted that neither the Open Space Preserve Alternative nor the No Project Alternative would achieve the basic project objectives as stated in Section 2.0, *Project Description*.

As an alternate development option, the Reduced Housing Units Alternative would reduce but not avoid the proposed project's significant and unavoidable visual character impacts and would also reduce impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, geology, greenhouse gases, hydrology and water quality, noise and transportation and circulation. Also, this alternative would achieve some of the basic project objectives as stated in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, including

- *To provide market rate, age-restricted housing opportunities to the senior community.*
- *To provide affordable, age-restricted housing opportunities to those seniors who qualify.*



- To diversify the range and type of high-quality housing choices available to Rancho Palos Verdes residents.
- To develop a residential community that is of an appropriate scale and density with the adjacent uses.
- To place moderate-density residential land uses within walking and bicycling distance of supportive uses.
- To create a residential community that would result in reduced per-capita greenhouse gas emissions through the use of moderate-density attached housing within walking distance of services.

Another alternate development option would be construction of a single story building directly adjacent to Crestridge Road to be occupied by another type of institutional use. While this alternative would not achieve the project objectives stated in Section 2.0, *Project Description*, it would reduce the significant unavoidable impact related to the change in the visual character of the site to a less than significant level. There is the potential for significant but mitigable impacts to result in the areas of Air Quality, Noise and Traffic and Circulation if the trip generation rate of the final institutional use selected is great enough that it results in exceedance of the relevant thresholds. This would need to be confirmed by a Traffic Impact Analysis once the institutional use was determined.

**Table 6-1  
 Impact Comparison of Alternatives**

Issue	Proposed Project	Alternatives			
		No Project	Reduced Housing Units	Open Space Preserve	Other Institutional
<b>Aesthetics</b>	=	+	=/+	+	+
Air Quality	=	+	=/+	+	=/-
Biological Resources	=	+	=/+	+	+
Geology	=	+	=/+	+	+
Greenhouse Gases	=	+	=/+	+	=/-
Hydrology and Water Quality	=	+	=/+	+	+
Noise	=	+	=/+	+	=/+
Transportation and Circulation	=	+	=/+	+	=/+

*Bold type indicates a significant and unavoidable impact*

*+ Superior to the proposed project analyzed in the EIR (reduced level of impact)*

*- Inferior to the proposed project analyzed in the EIR (increased level of impact)*

*=/+ slightly superior to the proposed project analyzed in the EIR in one or more aspects, but not significantly superior*

*=/- slightly inferior to the proposed project analyzed in the EIR in one or more aspects, but not significantly inferior*

*= Similar level of impact to the proposed project analyzed in the EIR*

