

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This chapter of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“Draft EIR”) is prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) for the proposed 8150 Sunset Boulevard Mixed-Use Project (the “Project”). In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15123, this chapter provides a brief description of the Project; identifies significant effects and proposed mitigation measures or alternatives that would reduce or avoid those effects; describes areas of controversy known to the lead agency; and presents issues to be resolved.

A. PROJECT LOCATION

The Project Site is located at 8150 W. Sunset Boulevard in the Hollywood community of the City of Los Angeles, at the foot of the Hollywood Hills, approximately seven miles northwest of Downtown Los Angeles. The site is well served by a network of regional transportation facilities. Various public transit stops operated by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) are located in close proximity to the Project Site, the Hollywood Freeway (State Route 101) is approximately two miles northeast of the site, Interstate 10 is approximately four miles south of the Project Site, and Interstate 405 is approximately six miles southwest of the site.

B. PROPOSED PROJECT

The Project Site is located at 8150 W. Sunset Boulevard in the Hollywood community of the City of Los Angeles, at the foot of the Hollywood Hills, approximately seven miles northwest of Downtown Los Angeles. The Project Site is located within the block bounded by Sunset Boulevard on the north, Havenhurst Drive on the west, Crescent Heights Boulevard on the east, and multi-family residential uses within the City of West Hollywood on the south. The Project Site is located in the western portion of the Hollywood Community of the City of Los Angeles, and therefore the site functions as a part of the eastern gateway to the Sunset Strip. The Project vicinity is highly urbanized and generally built-out. The Project Site, with frontage on Sunset Boulevard, lies in the more active regional center of Hollywood with its mixed-use blend of commercial, restaurant, bars, studio/production, office, entertainment and high density residential uses.

The Project would include approximately 111,339 square feet of commercial retail and restaurant uses within three lower levels (of which one level is subterranean) and one rooftop level, and 249 apartment units, including 28 affordable housing units, within twelve levels representing 222,564 gross square feet of residential space. The project would also provide a new, approximately 9,134 square-foot public space at the northeast corner of the Project Site (this area is, and will continue to be, owned by the City, although the Applicant will be required to improve and maintain the area), a 34,050 square-foot central public plaza at the site interior, public rooftop deck/garden areas along Sunset Boulevard, a private pool and pool deck area for residents, as well as other resident-only amenities totaling approximately 6,900 square feet that would include a residential lobby, resident recreation room, fitness center, business center, changing rooms and library. Parking for all proposed uses would be provided on-site via a seven-level (of which three levels are subterranean or semi-subterranean) parking structure housed within the podium structure that includes 849 total parking spaces (295 for residential uses and 554 for commercial retail and restaurant uses). Short- and long-term bicycle parking totaling approximately 985 spaces would also be provided on-site, including

428 spaces for residential uses and 557 spaces for commercial uses. The total development would include up to 333,872 square feet of commercial and residential space with a maximum floor-area ratio (FAR) of 3:1.

C. PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

As further described in Chapter 1, Introduction, the City circulated a Notice of Preparation (“NOP”) to State, regional, and local agencies, and members of the public for a 33-day review period, commencing September 13, 2013 and ending October 15, 2013. The purpose of the NOP was to formally convey that the City was preparing a Draft EIR for the proposed Project, and to solicit input regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the Draft EIR. See Appendix A-1, *Initial Study/Notice of Preparation*, of this Draft EIR.

In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on October 2, 2013 from 5:30 P.M. to 7:30 P.M. at the Will and Ariel Durant Branch Library, located at 7140 W. Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90046. The presentation materials and other documentation from the Scoping Meeting are provided in Appendix A-3, *Scoping Meeting Materials*, of this Draft EIR, while public comments received at the Scoping Meeting are contained in Appendix A-4, *Scoping Meeting Public Comments*. This Draft EIR will be released for a minimum 45-day public comment period. Following the public comment period, a Final EIR will be prepared that includes responses to the comments on the Draft EIR.

D. AREAS OF CONTROVERSY/ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

151 written comment letters responding to the NOP were submitted to the City. Responses to the NOP were provided by various public agencies, including the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, California Native Heritage Commission, South Coast Air Quality Management District, City Bureau of Engineering, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and the City of West Hollywood; several private organizations, including the Los Angeles Conservancy, Laurel Canyon Association, Crescent Heights-Havenhurst Neighborhood Preservation Association, the Federation of Hillside and Canyon Associations, Alla Nazimova Society, Granville Homeowners Association, the Stanley Hills Drive Community of Neighbors, and West Hollywood Preservation Alliance; and 102 individuals. In addition, approximately 70 individuals attended the public scoping meeting, and comments were received in writing on the scope and content of the Draft EIR. Environmental concerns raised in the public comments received during the NOP circulation period are provided in Appendix A-2, *NOP Comments*, of this Draft EIR and summarized below:

- Traffic impacts on local streets, intersections, and freeways
- Effect of traffic island conversion on traffic flow, safety, and access to public transit
- Cumulative impacts associated with other development projects in the area
- Setbacks and consistency with zoning requirements
- Noise and vibration from construction activities
- Noise from additional vehicle traffic and outdoor events/activities
- Effects on views from hillsides and surrounding neighborhoods

- Direct and indirect effects to on- and off-site historic resources, including the existing on-site Bank building
- Construction-related haul truck traffic impacts
- Height of proposed structures and associated impacts related to visual character and compatibility with surrounding development
- Vehicular access and internal vehicle circulation, including delivery and trash trucks
- Project Alternatives to be considered
- Impacts to public transit services
- Type and extent of signage and lighting for the Project, and impacts to surrounding uses
- Impacts related to emergency vehicle access and response times
- Energy consumption of the Project
- Adequacy of wastewater and solid waste disposal facilities
- Impacts associated with the adequacy of off-street parking to serve the Project during both construction and operation
- Impacts related to helipad operation and associated safety and noise impacts
- Air quality impacts resulting from construction and operation of the Project
- Glare effects from building surfaces and glass
- Health effects of parking garage exhaust and air pollutant emissions from additional traffic on local streets
- Risks to life and property from earthquake faults
- Health risks associated with potential hazardous materials located on-site
- Impacts to water supply from operation of the Project
- Flood and erosion hazards associated with additional runoff from the Project Site
- Inducement of population growth in the area and demands for public services and infrastructure
- Impacts to undiscovered Native American or other archaeological resources on the Project Site
- Potential impacts related to odors from on-site uses, particularly from outdoor areas
- Project-related greenhouse gas emissions and impacts to global climate change

E. SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Significant unavoidable impacts could occur as a result of Project impacts, cumulative impacts, and as a secondary effect from the implementation of a mitigation measure. Based on the analysis contained in Chapter 4, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, and Chapter 6, *Other CEQA Considerations*, the Project would result in significant historical resources impacts, significant construction noise and vibration impacts, and significant construction-related traffic impacts.

F. ALTERNATIVES

The State *CEQA Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(a) require an EIR to “describe the range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but will avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The State *CEQA Guidelines* emphasize that the selection of project alternatives be based primarily on the ability to reduce significant impacts relative to the proposed project, “even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.”¹ The State *CEQA Guidelines* further direct that the range of alternatives be guided by a “rule of reason,” such that only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice are analyzed.²

As described in detail in Chapter 5.0, Alternatives, of this Draft EIR, the following eight alternatives to the Project were analyzed: 1) No Project/No Build Alternative; 2) Existing Zoning Alternative; 3) Reduced Height Alternative; 4) Reduced Density Alternative; 5) Bank Preservation Alternative; 6) Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative; 7) On-Menu Alternative; and 8) Residential and Hotel Alternative. Based on an analysis of these alternatives, an environmentally superior alternative is identified. The eight alternatives, as well as the environmentally superior alternative, are summarized below.

1. Alternative 1: No Project/No Build Alternative

Under Alternative 1, the No Project/No Build Alternative, the Project Site would not be improved or changed from its current condition. Existing uses, including 80,000 square feet of retail, bank, restaurants, offices, and art storage, would continue to operate as under existing conditions. Parking would remain at 222 spaces. The reconfiguration of the adjacent City-owned traffic island at the southwest corner of Sunset and Crescent Heights Boulevards to provide a 9,134-square-foot public space (i.e., the Corner Plaza) would not occur.

2. Alternative 2: Existing Zoning Alternative

Under Alternative 2, the Existing Zoning Alternative, all existing buildings would be demolished and the Project Site would be developed with 111,339 square feet of new commercial uses to be located in three new buildings. This represents a net increase of 31,339 square feet of commercial retail uses compared to the existing 80,000 square feet of retail, office, restaurant, and bank uses. Total development would consist of 111,339 square feet of floor area, which would be the same amount of commercial development as under the Project, but with a maximum FAR of 1:1 and maximum building heights of 45 feet (as measured from the lowest elevation on the Project Site at the southwest corner of the property). No residential uses would be developed under this Alternative and the adjacent City-owned traffic island at the southwest corner of the Sunset Boulevard/Crescent Heights Boulevard intersection would not be improved to provide a public plaza. Vehicular site access would be provided via at-grade driveways on Sunset Boulevard, Crescent Heights Boulevard, and Havenhurst Drive, and on-site parking would be provided via a surface parking lot and new structured parking levels, with rooftop parking.

¹ *CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(b)*.

² *Ibid., Section 15126.6(f)*.

3. Alternative 3: Reduced Height Alternative

Alternative 3, the Reduced Height Alternative, would include the same development intensity as the Project with a maximum FAR of 3:1, but with a 25 percent reduction in the maximum height of the Project. As with the Project, this Alternative would entail the development of 249 residential units, including 28 affordable housing units, and 111,339 square feet of commercial uses over a central podium structure. The Reduced Height Alternative would have the same development intensity and floor area as the Project, but a lower overall building height, represented by a four-story reduction at the taller tower component of the South Building and a one-story increase at the lower component of the South Building. Building heights would range from two stories for the North Building along Sunset Boulevard, ten stories at the eastern portion of the South Building, compared to nine stories under the Project, and twelve stories, compared to 16 stories under the Project, at the western portion of the South Building.³ All uses, including residential, retail, restaurant, supermarket, health club, and walk-in bank, would have the same floor area as the Project. All other Project-related improvements, facilities, and amenities, including landscaped plazas, street trees, and the conversion of the City-owned traffic island to provide a 9,134-square-foot public space, would be similar to those of the Project. Under this Alternative, all existing buildings would be removed from the Project Site.

4. Alternative 4: Reduced Density Alternative

Alternative 4, the Reduced Density Alternative, would reduce overall development intensity by 25 percent relative to the Project. This would allow for 187 residential units, including 21 affordable housing units, compared to 249 units including 28 affordable units under the Project, and 83,500 square feet of commercial uses, compared to 111,339 square feet under the Project, for a maximum FAR of 2.25:1. The grocery store floor area would be 18,605 square feet, compared to 24,811 square feet under the Project. Total residential floor area would be 167,585 square feet, compared to 222,564 square feet under the Project. Total floor area would be 251,377 square feet, compared to 333,903 square feet under the Project. Building heights would remain the same as the Project, ranging from two stories at the North Building to 16 stories at the South Building. The reduced floor area would result in similar building footprints but an overall reduction in massing by removing two floors from the lower portion of the South Building for a height of seven floors, while maintaining taller 16-story South Building tower and the two-story North Building as under the Project.⁴ All other Project-related improvements, facilities, and amenities, including landscaped plazas, street trees, and the conversion of the adjacent City-owned traffic island to provide a 9,134 square-foot public space, would be similar to those of the Project. Under this Alternative, all existing buildings would be removed from the Project Site.

5. Alternative 5: Bank Preservation Alternative

Alternative 5, the Bank Preservation Alternative, would include the development of a mixed-use residential/commercial project on the Project Site at the same overall intensity as the Project, which has a maximum FAR of 3:1. However, this Alternative would increase residential units and decrease commercial floor area compared to the Project. The Bank Preservation Alternative would preserve the on-site Chase Bank building in its current location. Specifically, this Alternative would entail the removal of all existing

³ Due to the sloping nature of the Project Site, the 12-story portion of the South Building would appear to be 16 stories in height at the southwest area of the Project Site along Havenhurst Drive.

⁴ Due to the sloping nature of the Project Site, the 16-story portion of the South Building would appear to be 20 stories in height at the southwest area of the Project Site along Havenhurst Drive.

buildings on the Project Site except the Bank building. Alternative 5 would comprise the development of 291 residential units including 32 affordable housing units, compared to 249 residential units with 28 affordable units under the Project, and 62,231 square feet of commercial uses, compared to 111,339 square feet under the Project. Total residential floor area would be 271,969 square feet, compared to 222,564 square feet under the Project. Grocery store floor area would be up to 15,000 square feet, compared to 24,811 square feet under the Project. Total development would consist of approximately 334,200 square feet, compared to a total of 333,903 square feet under the Project. Building heights under this Alternative would range from two stories at the Sunset Boulevard retail frontage to 16 stories at the South Building, and the massing of the buildings would vary from that of the Project.⁵ Specifically, the South Building would include two tower elements, one along Havenhurst Drive at 16 stories in height (or approximately 200 feet above grade) and the other along Crescent Heights Boulevard at eight stories in height (or approximately 110 feet above grade), while the central portion of the building would be a maximum of six stories in height (or approximately 75 feet above grade). The Sunset retail frontage would include the existing Bank building, a new retail structure west of the Bank Building at the corner of Havenhurst Drive and Sunset Boulevard, and a new “flagship” retail building east of the Bank building at the corner of Sunset Boulevard and Crescent Heights Boulevard. Given the preservation of the Bank building, no rooftop activity would occur at the northwest corner of the Project Site. In addition, a rooftop bar/lounge would not be developed at the top of the South Building. Preservation of the Bank building under this Alternative would increase the depth of excavation necessary to construct below-grade parking since the area under the Bank building would not be used for parking, as it would be under the Project. Although the Bank Preservation Alternative, as with the Project, would provide three subterranean parking levels, additional excavation would be required compared to the Project to provide parking. All other Project-related improvements, facilities, and amenities, such as landscaping and the conversion of the adjacent City-owned traffic island to provide a 9,134 square-foot public space would be similar to those of the Project.

Under the Bank Preservation Alternative, as noted above, the Bank building would be retained and rehabilitated for commercial use in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Rehabilitation Standards (Standards). Alterations necessary for commercial use would include replacement of the existing non-original ground floor windows and replacement of exterior ground floor walls on the south and east elevations with new compatible windows, to improve transparency and views through the building. In addition, the existing false clerestory windows would be replaced with new compatible windows to allow natural light into the upper floor and provide views through the new clerestory windows of the folded-plate roof. The double-height interior atrium space would be closed by filling in the mezzanine level with a new floor. The new second floor would be designed to be reversible, and the existing mezzanine balcony and railings would be removed and stored, so that the atrium could be reinstated at a future date. The interior would be repurposed for the new commercial use which would require relocation of Roger Darricarrere’s *dalle de verre* stained glass *Screen*, either within the Bank building, elsewhere within the Project, or to another appropriate site where it would be preserved. The floating concrete stair at the Bank building’s northeast corner would be retained in place or rotated 180 degrees. The alterations and additions at the west end of the Bank building would be removed. The original Bouquet Canyon stone wall would be retained on the north façade along Sunset Boulevard, and *The Family*, by sculptor David Green would be retained and preserved in approximately its current location. The Sunset Boulevard frontage would be improved with compatible landscaping in keeping with the original Mid-Century Modern design intent. To

⁵ Due to the sloping nature of the Project Site, the 16-story portion of the South Building would appear to be 20 stories in height at the southwest area of the Project Site along Havenhurst Drive.

ensure conformance with the Standards, a qualified preservation consultant would be retained by the applicant to provide input during design development, review the plans for the Bank Preservation Alternative for conformance with the Standards, and conduct construction monitoring to address preservation issues that could arise during construction.

6. Alternative 6: Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative

Alternative 6, the Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative, would include the development of a mixed-use residential/commercial project on the Project Site at the same overall intensity as the Project (maximum FAR of 3:1), but would increase residential units and decrease commercial floor area. This Alternative would also preserve the on-site Chase Bank building in its current location. Specifically, this Alternative would entail the removal of all existing buildings on the Project Site except the Bank building. Total development would consist of 291 residential units, including 32 affordable housing units, and 62,231 square feet of commercial uses, including a reduced grocery store use of up to 15,000 square feet (compared to 24,811 square feet under the Project). Building heights under this Alternative would range from two stories at the Sunset Boulevard retail frontage to 16 stories at the South Building, and the massing of the buildings would vary from that of the Project.⁶ Specifically, the South Building would include two tower elements, one along Havenhurst Drive at 14 stories in height (or approximately 178 feet above grade) and the other along Crescent Heights Boulevard at 12 stories in height (or approximately 155 feet above grade), while the central portion of the building would be a maximum of six stories in height (or approximately 75 feet above grade). The Sunset retail frontage would include the existing Bank building, a new retail structure west of the Bank Building at the corner of Havenhurst Drive and Sunset Boulevard, and a new “flagship” retail building east of the Bank building at the corner of Sunset Boulevard and Crescent Heights Boulevard. Due to the preservation of the Bank building, no rooftop activity would occur at the northwest corner of the Project Site. In addition, the rooftop bar/lounge would not be developed at the top of the South Building. Preservation of the Bank building under this Alternative would increase the depth of excavation necessary to construct below-grade parking since the area underneath the bank building would not be used for parking, as it is under the Project. Although Alternative 6, as with the Project, would provide three subterranean parking levels, additional excavation would be required compared to the Project to provide parking. All other Project-related improvements, facilities, and amenities such as landscaping and the conversion of the adjacent City-owned traffic island to provide a 9,134 square-foot public space would be similar to those of the Project.

Under the Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative, as noted above, the Bank building would be retained and rehabilitated for commercial use in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Rehabilitation Standards (Standards). Alterations necessary for commercial use would include replacement of the existing non-original ground floor windows and replacement of exterior ground floor walls on the south and east elevations with new compatible windows, to improve transparency and views through the building. In addition, the existing false clerestory windows would be replaced with new compatible windows to allow natural light into the upper floor and provide views through the new clerestory windows of the folded-plate roof. The double-height interior atrium space would be closed by filling in the mezzanine level with a new floor. The new second floor would be designed to be reversible, and the existing mezzanine balcony and railings would be removed and stored, so that the atrium could be reinstated at a future date.

⁶ Due to the sloping nature of the Project Site, the 16-story portion of the South Building would appear to be 20 stories in height at the southwest area of the Project Site along Havenhurst Drive.

The interior would be repurposed for the new commercial use which would require relocation of Roger Darricarrere's *dalle de verre* stained glass *Screen*, either within the Bank building, elsewhere within the Project, or to another appropriate site where it would be preserved. The floating concrete stair at the Bank building's northeast corner would be retained in place or rotated 180 degrees. The alterations and additions at the west end of the Bank building would be removed. The original Bouquet Canyon stone wall would be retained on the north façade along Sunset Boulevard, and *The Family*, by sculptor David Green would be retained and preserved in approximately its current location. The Sunset Boulevard frontage would be improved with compatible landscaping in keeping with the original Mid-Century Modern design intent. To ensure conformance with the Standards, a qualified preservation consultant would be retained by the applicant to provide input during design development, review the plans for the Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative for conformance with the Standards, and conduct construction monitoring to address preservation issues that could arise during construction.

7. Alternative 7: On-Menu Alternative

Alternative 7, the On-Menu Alternative, would involve the construction of a new 28-story residential condominium tower over retail uses and structured parking levels, but would retain a number of existing uses on the Project Site, including the existing Chase Bank building and fast food drive-thru restaurant. Under Alternative 7, the Bank building would be retained and rehabilitated for commercial use in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Rehabilitation Standards (Standards), as under Alternatives 5 and 6 described above. The On-Menu Alternative would qualify for a 3:1 FAR for a portion of the Project Site pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22-A,25(f)(4)(ii) and a 1.35 FAR for the balance of the Project Site pursuant to LAMC Section 12.22-A,25(f)(4)(i). The Alternative would have an overall FAR of approximately 2.5:1. This Alternative would provide 146 residential units including 30 affordable housing units (compared to 249 units with 28 affordable units under the Project). Commercial uses, including existing uses to be retained and new retail construction, would comprise approximately 47,500 square feet of floor area (compared to 111,339 square feet of commercial floor area under the Project), a reduction of approximately 57-percent compared to the Project. Total residential floor area would be 228,032 square feet (compared to 222,564 square feet under the Project), which includes resident-only amenities such as a pool/pool deck, recreation room, resident bar/lounge, fitness room, business center/library, changing rooms, and private terraces. Total floor area would be 278,032 square feet, which represents an over 17-percent reduction compared to the Project, which has a total developed floor area of 333,903 square feet. The residential component would include 116 market rate units (31 one-bedroom, 50 two-bedroom, 23 three-bedroom, and 12 four-bedroom units) and 30 affordable one-bedroom units in 23 stories over five levels of structured above- and below-grade parking. Commercial uses would include retail space, sit-down restaurants, fast-food restaurants (existing), and a walk-in bank (existing). Building heights under this Alternative would reach a maximum of 28 stories. Because commercial floor area would be substantially reduced and retail uses, such as the grocery store proposed under the Project would not be provided, parking requirements for the On-Menu Alternative would be substantially reduced compared to the Project. Thus, the Project's subterranean parking Level B2 would be eliminated and a sizeable reduction in Project-related grading and excavation volumes would be achieved. On-site amenities would include public and private open space, such as the Corner Plaza, Central Plaza, roof terraces, and pool deck, as well as landscaping and the conversion of the adjacent City-owned traffic island to provide a 9,134 square-foot public space would be similar to those of the Project.

8. Alternative 8: Residential and Hotel Alternative

Alternative 8, the Residential and Hotel Alternative, would remove all existing buildings from the Project Site for the construction of residential condominiums, a full-service, 180-room hotel, and restaurant space within the hotel. The Alternative would have an FAR of approximately 3:1, and would have a nearly identical design to the Project with a 9- to 16-story South Building containing hotel and residential uses and a two-story North Building containing hotel accessory uses over a single podium structure.⁷ This Alternative would provide 115 residential units including 13 affordable housing units (compared to 249 units including 28 affordable units under the Project). The hotel and related accessory uses would comprise approximately 153,381 square feet of floor area (compared to 111,339 square feet of commercial floor area under the Project). Total residential floor area would be 179,888 square feet (compared to 222,564 square feet under the Project). Total floor area would be 333,269 square feet, which represents a small reduction compared to the Project, which has a total developed floor area of 333,903 square feet. The hotel use would comprise 135 standard rooms and 45 suites in the 9-story portion of the South Building over structured above- and below-grade parking. Hotel accessory uses would include a restaurant, bar/lounge, fitness center, and meeting rooms. Because commercial floor area would be substantially reduced and retail uses, such as the grocery store proposed under the Project, would not be provided, parking requirements for the Residential and Hotel Alternative would be somewhat reduced compared to the Project. Thus, the Project's subterranean parking Level B2 would be reduced in area by over 50 percent, and thus a sizeable reduction in Project-related grading and excavation volumes would be achieved.⁸ On-site amenities, which would include public and private open space, Central Plaza, roof terraces, pool deck, and rooftop restaurant/lounge, landscaping, and the conversion of the adjacent City-owned traffic island to provide the 9,134 square-foot public Corner Plaza would be similar to those of the Project.

9. Environmentally Superior Alternative

Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the State *CEQA Guidelines* indicates that an analysis of alternatives to a proposed project shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR and that if the "no project" alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR shall identify another environmentally superior alternative among the remaining alternatives. With respect to identifying an Environmentally Superior Alternative among those analyzed in this Draft EIR, the range of feasible Alternatives includes the No Project/No Build Alternative, Existing Zoning Alternative, Reduced Height Alternative, Reduced Density Alternative, Bank Preservation Alternative, Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative, On-Menu Alternative, and Residential and Hotel Alternative.

The No Project/No Build Alternative is considered the overall environmentally superior Alternative as it would avoid nearly all of the impacts that would occur under the Project. It should be noted however, that although most impacts would be avoided under the No Project/No Build Alternative, beneficial aspects of the Project, such as the upgrading of the property with distinctive architecture and landscaping and the fulfillment of numerous regional and City plan and policy goals for the area would not occur. As indicated

⁷ Due to the sloping nature of the Project Site, the 16-story building would appear to be 20 stories in height at the southwest area of the Project Site along Havenhurst Drive.

⁸ The Project would provide 849 total parking spaces, with 373 spaces provided on Level B2. Alternative 8 would provide a total of 641 total parking spaces, or 208 fewer spaces than under the Project. Given the same parking configuration, this translates to a reduction of approximately 55 percent fewer spaces required on Level B2 ($208/373 = 55.8\%$).

above, without development of a mixed-use residential and commercial project at the Project Site, the No Project/No Build Alternative would only partially meet one of the Project's 15 objectives.

In accordance with the State *CEQA Guidelines* requirement to identify an environmentally superior Alternative other than the No Project/No Build Alternative, a comparative evaluation of the remaining Alternatives indicates that the Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative would be the environmentally superior Alternative. This Alternative would eliminate a significant unavoidable impact to historical resources through preservation and reuse of the Bank building, would reduce but not eliminate a significant unavoidable temporary impact associated with construction-related noise, and would otherwise reduce the majority of Project-related impacts to some degree. More specifically, this Alternative would result in reduced impacts associated with views, shade/shadow, operational air quality, historical resources, greenhouse gas emissions, land use compatibility, construction noise, local intersection traffic, neighborhood roadway segment traffic, and solid waste. The Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative would result in similar impacts regarding visual character, light and glare, AQMP consistency, construction air quality, geology and soils, consistency with GHG reduction plans, land use plan consistency, construction vibration, operational noise and vibration, population growth, housing supply, fire protection, and police protection. This Alternative would result in incrementally greater impacts for other topics due increased excavation and an increase of 42 residential units. As with the Project, and with the exception of construction traffic, these impacts associated with employment, libraries, water supply, and wastewater would be less than significant, and impacts associated with archaeological and paleontological resources and parks and recreation would be less than significant with mitigation. As such, the Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative is considered environmentally superior among the various build Alternatives.

None of the build Alternatives, including the Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative, would eliminate the significant unavoidable temporary impacts related to construction noise and vibration, and only the Existing Zoning Alternative would eliminate the temporary construction traffic impact. Three of the Alternatives would preserve and reuse the existing Bank building (Bank Preservation Alternative, Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative, and On-Menu Alternative), thus eliminating a significant unavoidable impact to historical resources. While both the Bank Preservation Alternative and Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative would result in the fewest significant unavoidable impacts (three significant unavoidable impacts) of the build Alternatives, the Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative would, overall, reduce more impacts relative to the Project than the Bank Preservation Alternative.

Additionally, the Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative would only partially meet three of the key Project objectives related to provision of commercial uses for on-site residents and the surrounding community and increasing economic activity and employment opportunities. Specifically, the Reduced Height and Bank Preservation Alternative would provide convenient and high-quality commercial uses to serve both Project residents and the surrounding community, and also enhance the character of the neighborhood, but it would not contribute to a synergy of site uses at the level the Project would due to the reduced commercial floor area. Further, this Alternative would maintain and enhance the economic vitality of the region by providing job opportunities associated with the construction and operation of proposed uses, and would attract commercial and residential tenants to the Project, but would provide fewer job opportunities and reduced on-site economic activity due to the reduction in commercial uses. However, this Alternative would achieve the remaining Project objectives.

G. SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section provides a summary of impacts, Project Design Features, mitigation measures, and level of impact after implementation of mitigation measures associated with Project. The summary is provided by environmental issue area below in **Table ES-1**, *Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures*.

Table ES-1

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
4.A Aesthetics			
4.A.1 Visual Character			
Impact Statement AES-1: The Project would provide a modern building design, street trees, and landscaped public open space. As such, once constructed, the Project would have a less than significant impact with respect to aesthetic character. However, construction activities on-site could substantially alter or degrade the existing visual character of the area on a temporary basis. Therefore, the Project would have a potentially significant impact with respect to aesthetic character during construction.	Not Applicable	Mitigation Measure AES-1: The Applicant shall provide a 12-foot construction fence for neighborhood protection during construction of the Project. Mitigation Measure AES-2: The Applicant shall ensure through appropriate postings and daily visual inspections that no unauthorized materials are posted on any temporary construction barriers or temporary pedestrian walkways, and that such temporary barriers and walkways are maintained in a visually attractive manner throughout the construction period.	Less than Significant after Mitigation
4.A.2 View Impacts			
Impact Statement AES-2: The Project would not obstruct focal or panoramic views across the Project Site or alter an existing recognized or valued public view. As such, impacts in this regard would be less than significant.	Not Applicable	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant
4.A.3 Light and Glare			
Impact Statement AES-3: New light sources associated primarily with the Project's residential uses and terrace dining areas would not substantially alter the character of off-	Not Applicable	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
site areas surrounding the Project Site or result in substantial light spill/or glare onto adjacent light-sensitive receptors. The Project would be designed with non-reflective glass and trim and, thus, reduce reflection potential. Therefore, potential impacts associated with nighttime illumination and glare from reflected sunlight would be less than significant.			
4.A.4 Shading			
Impact Statement AES-4: The Project would not shade shadow-sensitive uses for more than three hours between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. PST, or more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. PDT. Shade/shadow impacts would be less than significant.	Not Applicable	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant
4.A.5 Consistency With Regulatory Framework			
Impact Statement AES-5: The Project would be substantially consistent with applicable guidelines or regulations related to aesthetics or visual quality. Impacts would be less than significant.	Not Applicable	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant
4.B Air Quality			
4.B.1 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) Consistency			
Impact Statement AQ-1: Construction and operation of the Project would not conflict with the	Not Applicable	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
<p>growth projections in the SCAQMD AQMP and would comply with applicable control measures. As a result, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Plan and impacts would be less than significant.</p>			
4.B.2 Air Quality Standards			
<p>Impact Statement AQ-2: Construction of the Project would not exceed the applicable SCAQMD daily numeric indicators for VOC, CO, SO₂, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5} but would potentially exceed the numeric indicator for NO_x. Operation of the Project would not exceed the SCAQMD daily regional numeric indicators. As a result, construction of the Project would result in a potentially significant air quality impact for NO_x during construction. With respect to operations, the Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation and operational impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>PDF-AQ-1: Green Building Measures: The Project would be designed and operated to meet or exceed the applicable requirements of the State of California Green Building Standards Code and the City of Los Angeles Green Building Code and achieve the USGBC LEED® Silver Certification. The Project would incorporate measures and performance standards to support its LEED® Silver Certification, which include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Project would implement a construction waste management plan to recycle and/or salvage a minimum of 75 percent of nonhazardous construction debris or minimize the generation of construction waste to 2.5 pounds per square foot of building floor area. (LEED® 	<p>Mitigation Measure AQ-1: The Applicant shall utilize off-road diesel-powered construction equipment that meet Tier 3 off-road emissions standards for those equipment rated at 50 hp or greater and Tier 4 off-road emissions standards for those equipment rated at 200 hp or greater during the grading/excavation and building construction phases of Project construction. A copy of each unit's certified tier specification and CARB or SCAQMD operating permit shall be available upon request at the time of mobilization of each applicable unit of equipment. The Applicant shall encourage construction contractors to apply for SCAQMD "SOON" funds. Incentives could be provided for those construction contractors who apply for SCAQMD "SOON" funds. The "SOON" program provides funds to accelerate clean-up of off-road diesel vehicles, such as heavy-duty construction equipment. More information on this program can</p>	<p>Less than Significant after Mitigation</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
	<p>Materials and Resources Credit 5 [v4]⁹);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Project would be designed to optimize energy performance and reduce building energy cost by 10 percent for new construction compared to ASHRAE 90.1-2010, Appendix G and the Title 24 Building Standards Code. The energy optimization would be achieved by incorporating energy efficient designs that may include energy efficient heating, ventilation, and HVAC systems, energy efficient windows, energy efficient insulation, or other appropriate measures. Prior to building permit issuance, sufficient proof of energy optimization shall be made available in accordance with LEED®, which may include building energy simulations, past energy simulation analyses for similar buildings, or published data from analyses for similar buildings. (LEED® Energy and Atmosphere Credit 2 [v4]); 	<p>be found at the following website: http://www.aqmd.gov/tao/Implementation/SOONProgram.htm.</p>	

⁹ The bracketed text “v4” denotes version 4 of the LEED® Building Design and Construction credits.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="621 331 1039 1105"> <p>▪ The Project would reduce emissions through the use of grid-source, renewable energy technologies and carbon mitigation projects. The Project would engage in a contract for qualified resources, for a minimum of five years, to be delivered at least annually. The contract would specify the provision of 100 percent of the Project’s energy from green power, carbon offsets, and/or renewable energy certificates (“RECs”) during the first five years of operation. The Project would commit to providing a minimum of 15 percent of the Project’s energy from green power, carbon offsets, and/or RECs for two years after the minimum five year period. (LEED® Energy and Atmosphere Credit 7 [v4]); and</p> <li data-bbox="621 1127 1039 1312"> <p>▪ The Project would reduce indoor water use by a minimum of 35 percent by installing water fixtures that exceed applicable standards. (LEED® Water Efficiency Credit 2 [v4]).</p> 		

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
4.B.3 Non-Attainment Pollutants			
<p>Impact Statement AQ-3: Construction of the Project would potentially exceed the SCAQMD daily regional numeric indicators for emissions of NO_x, which is an ozone precursor. Operation of the Project would not exceed the SCAQMD daily regional numeric indicators for emissions of non-attainment pollutants. Thus, construction of the Project would potentially result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment and construction impacts would be potentially significant. With respect to operations, the Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is non-attainment and operational impacts would be less than significant.</p>	See PDF-AQ-1.	See Mitigation Measure AQ-1.	Less than Significant after Mitigation
4.B.4 Substantial Pollutant Concentrations			
<p>Impact Statement AQ-4: Construction of the Project would not exceed SCAQMD localized significance thresholds for NO_x and CO at nearby sensitive receptors but would potentially exceed the localized significance threshold for PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}. Operation of the Project would not exceed SCAQMD localized</p>	Not Applicable	See Mitigation Measure AQ-1.	Less than Significant after Mitigation

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
<p>significance thresholds at nearby sensitive receptors for NO_x, CO, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}. Construction and operation of the Project would not result in substantial emissions of toxic air contaminants at nearby sensitive receptors and would not exceed SCAQMD numeric indicators of an incremental increase in cancer risk of 10 in one million and non-cancer chronic and acute health impact of 1.0. Construction and operation of the Project would not result in traffic congestion that would cause or contribute to formation of localized CO hotspots that exceed the CAAQS or NAAQS. As a result, construction and operation of the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, with the exception of localized PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions during construction. Thus, localized emissions of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} during construction would result in a potentially significant impact.</p>			
<p>4.B.5 Consistency of the Project with Applicable Plans and Policies</p>			
<p>Impact Statement AQ-5: Project uses, including residential, retail, and restaurant uses, would be consistent with adopted regulatory policies and guidance regarding air quality. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>	See PDF-AQ-1.	Not Applicable	Less than Significant
<p>4.C.1 Cultural Resources –</p>			

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
Archaeological and Paleontological Resources			
4.C.1.1 Archaeological Resources			
<p>Impact Statement ARCH-1: The Project would involve excavation into sediments where there is potential for the existence of archaeological resources below the existing built environment on the Project Site. Therefore, impacts on buried archaeological resources are considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure ARCH-1: The Applicant shall retain a qualified archaeological monitor who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for an archaeologist. The monitor shall be present during construction excavations such as grading, trenching, grubbing, or any other construction excavation activity associated with the Project. The frequency of monitoring shall be determined by the monitor based on the rate of excavation activities, the materials being excavated (native versus fill sediments), and the depth of excavation, and, if found, the proximity, abundance, and type of archaeological resources encountered.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure ARCH-2: In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, the archaeological monitor shall be empowered to halt or redirect ground-disturbing activities away from the vicinity of the find so that the find can be evaluated. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the vicinity of the find. All archaeological resources unearthed by Project construction activities shall be evaluated by the archaeologist. The Applicant shall</p>	<p>Less than Significant after Mitigation</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		<p>coordinate with the archaeologist and the City to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the resources if they are determined to be potentially eligible for the California Register or potentially qualify as unique archaeological resources pursuant to CEQA. Treatment may include implementation of archaeological data recovery excavations to remove the resource or preservation in place.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure ARCH-3: The archaeological monitor shall prepare a final report at the conclusion of archaeological monitoring. The report shall be submitted by the Applicant to the City, the South Central Coastal Information Center, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the Project and required mitigation measures. The report shall include a description of resources unearthed, if any, treatment of the resources, and evaluation of the resources with respect to the California Register. The Applicant, in consultation with the archaeologist and the City, shall designate repositories meeting State standards in the event that archaeological material is recovered. Project material shall be curated in accordance with the State Historical Resources Commission’s Guidelines for</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
<p>Impact Statement ARCH-2: The Project would involve excavation into sediments where there is potential for the existence of human remains below the existing built environment on the Project Site. Therefore, impacts on buried human remains are considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>Curation of Archaeological Collections.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure ARCH-4: If human remains are encountered unexpectedly during construction of the Project, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission (“NAHC”). The NAHC shall then identify the person(s) thought to be the Most Likely Descendent (“MLD”). The MLD may, with the permission of the Applicant, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American remains and may recommend means for treating or disposing, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods. The MLD shall complete their inspection and make their recommendation within 48 hours of being granted access by the Applicant to inspect the discovery. The recommendation may include the scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials. Upon the discovery of the Native American remains, the Applicant shall ensure, according to generally accepted cultural or archaeological standards or practices, that the immediate vicinity</p>	<p>Less than Significant after Mitigation</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		<p>where the Native American human remains are located is not damaged or disturbed by further development activity until the Applicant has discussed and conferred, as prescribed in this mitigation measure, with the MLD regarding their recommendations, if applicable, taking into account the possibility of multiple human remains. The Applicant shall discuss all reasonable options with the descendants regarding the descendants' preferences for treatment.</p> <p>Whenever the NAHC is unable to identify a MLD, or the MLD identified fails to make a recommendation, or the Applicant or his or her authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendants and the mediation provided for in Subdivision (k) of PRC Section 5097.94, if invoked, fails to provide measures acceptable to the Applicant, the Applicant or his or her authorized representative shall inter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance.</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
<p>4.C.1.2 Paleontological Resources</p>			
<p>Impact Statement PALEO-1: The Project would involve excavation into sediments where there is potential for the existence of paleontological resources below the existing built environment on the Project Site. Therefore, impacts on buried unique or significant paleontological resources are considered potentially significant.</p>	<p>Not Applicable</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure PALEO-1: A qualified Paleontologist shall attend a pre-grade meeting and develop a paleontological monitoring program for excavations into older Quaternary Alluvium deposits. A qualified paleontologist is defined as a paleontologist meeting the criteria established by the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology. The qualified Paleontologist shall supervise a paleontological monitor who shall be present during construction excavations into older Quaternary Alluvium deposits. Monitoring shall consist of visually inspecting fresh exposures of rock for larger fossil remains and, where appropriate, collecting wet or dry screened sediment samples of promising horizons for smaller fossil remains. The frequency of monitoring inspections shall be determined by the Paleontologist and shall be based on the rate of excavation and grading activities, the materials being excavated, and the depth of excavation, and if found, the abundance and type of fossils encountered.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure PALEO-2: If a potential fossil is found, the Paleontological Monitor shall be allowed to temporarily divert or redirect grading and excavation activities in the area of</p>	<p>Less than Significant after Mitigation</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		<p>the exposed fossil to facilitate evaluation and, if necessary, salvage. At the Paleontologist’s discretion and to reduce any construction delay, the grading and excavation contractor shall assist in removing rock samples for initial processing.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure PALEO-3: Any fossils encountered and recovered shall be prepared to the point of identification and catalogued before they are donated to their final repository. Any fossils collected shall be donated to a public, non-profit institution with a research interest in the materials, such as the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County. Accompanying notes, maps, and photographs shall also be filed at the repository.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure PALEO-4: Following the completion of the above measures, the Paleontologist shall prepare a report summarizing the results of the monitoring and salvaging efforts, the methodology used in these efforts, as well as a description of the fossils collected and their significance. The report shall be submitted by the Project Applicant to the lead agency, the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, and representatives of other appropriate or concerned agencies to signify the satisfactory completion of the</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		Project and required mitigation measures.	
4.C.1.3 Cumulative Impacts			
Impact Statement ARCH-3: Cumulative growth would increase the amount of excavation in the Project vicinity and therefore the potential to encounter archaeological resources. However, impacts of the Project regarding archaeological resources would be less than significant with mitigation. Related Projects would be subject to regulations and CEQA Guidelines to avoid adverse effects on archaeological resources. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.	Not Applicable	See Mitigation Measure ARCH-1.	Less than Significant after Mitigation
Impact Statement PALEO-2: Cumulative growth would increase the amount of excavation in the Project vicinity and therefore the potential to encounter paleontological resources. However, impacts of the Project regarding paleontological resources would be less than significant. Related Projects would be expected to implement standard mitigation measure to avoid adverse effects on paleontological resources. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.	Not Applicable	See Mitigation Measures PALEO-1 through PALEO-4.	Less than Significant after Mitigation
4.C .2 Cultural Resources – Historical Resources			
Impact Statement HIST-1: The Project would demolish the Bank such that it would be rendered ineligible for the National Register, California	Not applicable.	Mitigation Measure HIST-1: <u>Recordation</u> . Prior to demolition and rehabilitation, the project applicant shall prepare a Historic American Buildings	Significant and Unavoidable.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
<p>Register, or as a City Monument. Therefore, Project impacts on the Bank structure would be significant and unavoidable.</p>		<p>Survey (HABS) Level II documentation for the Bank and remaining historic property setting, including the parking lot ramp to the former rooftop of the Lytton Center, the staircase and planter from the former Lytton Center on the west side of the Project Site, landscape along the primary Bank elevation, Bouquet Canyon stone wall extending from the primary Bank elevation to the corner of Sunset and Havenhurst, and patio in front of the west Bank elevation. The HABS document shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian, historic architect, or historic preservation professional who satisfies the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History, Architectural History, or Architecture</i>, pursuant to 36 CFR 61. This document shall record the history of the property and architecture, as well as important events or other significant contributions to the patterns and trends of history with which the property is associated, as appropriate. The property's physical condition, both historic and current, shall be documented through site plans; historic maps and photographs; original as-built drawings; large format photographs; and written data. The building exteriors, representative interior spaces, character-defining features, as well as the property setting and contextual views shall be documented. Field photographs and</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		<p>notes shall also be included. All documentation components shall be completed in accordance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation</i> (HABS standards). The HABS documentation shall be submitted to the National Park Service for transmittal to the Library of Congress, and archival copies shall be sent to the City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources and Los Angeles Public Library.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HIST-2: Relocation of Two Art Works. Pursuant to CEQA and the California Art Preservation Act, the two existing integrated artworks on the Project Site including Roger Darricarrere's <i>Screen</i> and David Green's <i>The Family</i> are of recognized quality and shall be relocated and incorporated into the Project design or preserved at an off-site location. The families of the artists shall be notified of the extant artworks and every attempt shall be made to relocate the artworks to an appropriate setting. A relocation plan would be prepared by a qualified professional conservator and implemented in accordance with nationally recognized conservation guidelines including the Code of Ethics and the Guidelines for Practice of the American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		<p>Works.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HIST-3: <u>Relocation of Bank.</u> Since retention of the Bank is not feasible for implementation and development of the Project, a feasibility study, subject to City review and approval, shall be prepared weighing the costs, advantages, and disadvantages of relocation. If the study concludes it is feasible to relocate the Bank, the structure’s availability in historic preservation websites shall be advertised for a period of not less than thirty (30) days by the Applicant. Any such relocation efforts shall be undertaken in accordance with a Relocation and Rehabilitation Plan prepared by the party taking possession of the structure to be moved. The Relocation and Rehabilitation Plan shall be developed in conjunction with a qualified architectural historian, historic architect, or historic preservation professional who satisfies the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for History, Architectural History, or Architecture, pursuant to 36 CFR 61. The Plan shall include relocation methodology recommended by the National Park Service, which are outlined in the booklet entitled “Moving Historic Buildings,” by John Obed Curtis (1979). Upon relocation of the structure to the new site, any maintenance, repair,</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		<p>stabilization, rehabilitation, preservation, conservation, or reconstruction work performed in conjunction with the relocation of the building shall be undertaken in a manner consistent with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Properties</i>. The Relocation and Rehabilitation Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Los Angeles Office of Historic Resources prior to its implementation. In addition, a plaque describing the date of the move and the original location shall be placed in a visible location on of the Bank. Relocation shall not take place until the Bank is first recorded pursuant to Mitigation Measure HIST-1: Recordation.</p> <p>If after three (3) months it is evident that no party is interested in purchasing the Bank per the mitigation measure stipulated above, then Mitigation Measures HIST-1 and HIST-2 would be required to document and salvage the important history and architecture of the Bank.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure HIST-4: <u>Demolition Monitoring and Salvage</u>. The project applicant shall retain a qualified architectural historian to conduct construction monitoring during</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		<p>demolition. Any important historic fabric associated with the period of significance from 1959-1969, shall be fully recorded in photographic images and written manuscript notes. Prior to the commencement of demolition, significant material such as the concrete-folded plate roof shall be inventoried and evaluated for potential salvage, analysis and interpretation. A qualified architectural historian or historic preservation professional who satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural History, pursuant to 36 CFR 61, shall prepare the necessary written and illustrated documentation in a construction monitoring and salvage report. This document shall record the history of the Bank's reinforced concrete construction methods during the period of significance as well document its present physical condition through site plans; historic maps and photographs; sketch maps; digital photography; and written data and text. All documentation components shall be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and for Archaeological Documentation for above ground structures. The completed documentation shall be placed on file at the South Central Coastal Information Center, California State University, Fullerton, CA; and the City of Los Angeles Public Library. Findings shall be</p>	

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		incorporated into the HABS report (see Mitigation Measure HIST-1 above).	
Impact Statement HIST-2: Direct impacts of new construction on historic resources within the Project Site would be significant and unavoidable due to the demolition of the Bank. Indirect impacts would be less than significant as the Project would not reduce the integrity or significance of important historical resources in the Project vicinity.	Not applicable.	See Mitigation Measures HIST-1 through HIST-4.	Direct impacts: Significant and Unavoidable. Indirect impacts: Less than Significant.
4.D Geology and Soils			
4.D.1 Geologic Hazards			
Impact Statement GS-1: Implementation of the Project could result in significant risks to life or property given the seismic conditions at the Project Site. While impacts regarding surface fault rupture, liquefaction, landslides, and expansive soils would be less than significant given compliance with applicable building codes and seismic design standards, impacts associated with seismic ground shaking and temporary excavations and site stability would be potentially significant.	Not applicable.	Mitigation Measure GS-1: Prior to issuance of a grading permit, a qualified geotechnical engineer shall prepare and submit to the Department of Building and Safety a final Geotechnical Report that provides recommendations to address seismic safety and design requirements for foundations, retaining walls/shoring, and excavation. A qualified geotechnical engineer shall be retained by the Applicant to be present on the Project Site during excavation, grading, and general site preparation activities to monitor the implementation of the recommendations specified in the Geotechnical Report as well as other recommendations made in subsequent Geotechnical Reports prepared for the project subject to City review and approval. When/if needed, the geotechnical engineer shall provide	Less than Significant after Mitigation

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		structure-specific geologic and geotechnical recommendations which shall be documented in a report to be approved by the City and appended to the project's previous Geotechnical Reports.	
4.D.2 Sedimentation and Erosion			
Impact Statement GS-2: Implementation of the Project would not result in substantial erosion or sedimentation given compliance with applicable regulations. Therefore, impacts regarding geologic hazards would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant
4.D.3 Landform Alteration			
Impact Statement GS-3: The Project Site is currently completely developed with urban uses and does not contain any distinct or prominent geologic or topographic features that could be destroyed, permanently covered, or materially and adversely modified as a result of the Project. Therefore, no impacts regarding landform alteration would result from Project implementation.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant
4.E Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
4.E.1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Impact Statement GHG-1: Construction and operation of the Project would not generate a net increase in annual GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, in excess of the draft SCAQMD Tier 3 indicator	See PDF-AQ-1.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
of significance. As a result, construction and operation of the Project would generate GHG emissions that would have a less than significant impact on the environment.			
4.E.2 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plans			
Impact Statement GHG-2: Construction and operation of the Project would not conflict with applicable GHG emissions reductions plans, policies, or regulations. As a result, construction and operation of the Project would not have a significance impact with respect to consistency with GHG reduction plans and impacts would be less than significant.	See PDF-AQ-1.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant
4.F Land Use			
4.F.1 Consistency of the Proposed Project with Applicable Plans and Policies			
Impact Statement LU-1: The Project, including land use, density, and FAR would be consistent with adopted regulatory policies and guidance governing the relationship between land uses in the Project vicinity. Impacts would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
4.F.2 Land Use Compatibility			
Impact Statement LU-2: The Project would be generally consistent with the existing pattern of development on Sunset Boulevard in which residential	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
<p>uses are juxtaposed to commercial uses located along Sunset Boulevard in the City of Los Angeles and the adjacent City of West Hollywood. The Project would not alter existing land use patterns or cause a long-term change in the neighborhood through disruption, division, or isolation. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>4.G Noise</p>			
<p>4.G.1 Construction</p>			
<p>Impact Statement Noise-1: On-site construction noise associated with the Project would expose nearby residential uses to noise levels in excess of established thresholds. Therefore, impacts would be considered potentially significant. However, mitigation measures are provided to address this impact.</p>	<p>PDF-Noise-1, The project contractor(s) would equip all construction equipment, fixed or mobile, with properly operating and maintained noise mufflers, consistent with manufacturers’ standards.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure Noise-1: Temporary noise barriers shall be used to block the line-of-site between construction equipment and noise-sensitive receptors during project construction, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide a temporary 15-foot tall noise barrier along the eastern boundary of the Project construction site to reduce construction noise at the multi-family residential uses along Crescent Heights Boulevard (Location R3). ▪ Provide a temporary 15-foot tall noise barrier along the southern and western boundaries of the Project construction site to reduce construction noise at the multi-family residential uses along Havenhurst Drive (Location R4). ▪ Provide a temporary 15-foot tall 	<p>Less than Significant after Mitigation.</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		<p>noise barrier along the northern boundary of the Project construction site to reduce construction noise at the single-family residential uses along Selma Avenue (Location R5).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure Noise-2: Construction activities which have the potential to produce substantial vibration shall be scheduled so as to allow only one piece of such equipment to operate within 50 feet of the multi-family residential uses along the southern boundary of the Project Site.</p>	
<p>Impact Statement Noise-2: Off-site construction traffic would not increase ambient noise levels at residential uses along the haul route by 5 dBA or more. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p>4.G.2 Operation</p>			
<p>Impact Statement Noise-3: Project implementation would increase noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive receptors in the Project area. However, Project-related noise would not exceed established thresholds and therefore impacts would be less than significant.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p>Impact Statement Noise-4: Project implementation would increase noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive receptors in the Project vicinity. However, Project-related noise</p>	<p>PDF-Noise-2, Exterior amplified music from the event areas (i.e. Sunset Terrace, Rooftop Lounge Terrace, etc.) shall be limited to a maximum sound level of 86 dBA at</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
generation would not exceed established thresholds, therefore impacts would be less than significant.	<p>approximately 25 feet from the event area boundaries. The business operator(s) and/or event coordinators shall ensure that sound equipment is calibrated semi-annually.</p> <p>PDF-Noise-3, Exterior amplified music from the event areas of Internal Patios and Central Plaza shall be limited to a maximum sound level of 80 dBA at approximately 10 feet from the event area boundaries. The business operator(s) and/or event coordinators shall ensure that sound equipment is calibrated semi-annually.</p>		
Impact Statement Noise-5: Project implementation would not increase noise levels associated with the parking structure at adjacent noise-sensitive receptors in the Project area above existing ambient noise levels. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
Impact Statement Noise-6: Proposed residential uses would not be exposed to significant noise impacts with implementation of Regulatory Measure-Noise-3.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
4.G.3 Vibration			
Impact Statement Noise-7: Construction activities would result in sporadic, temporary vibration effects adjacent to the Project Site, which	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Significant and Unavoidable.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
would exceed established thresholds. Thus, construction vibration impacts would be potentially significant.			
Impact Statement Noise-8: Project operation would not generate excessive vibration levels at nearby sensitive receptor locations. Thus, long-term vibration impacts would be less than significant. However, temporary construction-related vibration would exceed established thresholds, and therefore impacts in this regard would be significant and unavoidable.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Significant and Unavoidable.
4.H Population, Housing, and Employment			
4.H.1 Construction			
Impact Statement PH-1: The Project's construction phase would have no impact on the supply of housing units or population growth. Construction activities would create work for an estimated 200 construction workers at any given time during project construction. Construction workers would be drawn from a regional pool of workers. The short-term employment opportunities would contribute to the local and regional economy. Impacts of construction activity would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
4.H.2 Operation			
Impact Statement PH-2: The Project would create new housing units and	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
generate a new residential population, as well as generate new employment opportunities. This is consistent with SCAG's short-term and long-term growth projections for the Community Plan area and the City of Los Angeles, and helps the City meet its housing obligation under the SCAG RHNA allocation. Impacts regarding the relationship of the Project to SCAG growth projections would be less than significant.			
Impact Statement PH-3: The Project represents a mixed-use development that would add residential, and commercial retail and restaurants uses to a developed area within the Hollywood Community Plan area. The types and amounts of development would be within the range anticipated in applicable policies and growth projections. The Project also represents infill development that supports the development of increased population density outside of existing neighborhoods and enhanced retail services to serve existing nearby population. Therefore, impacts regarding consistency with the regulatory framework would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
Cumulative			
Impact Statement PH-4: The related projects considered in the analysis of	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
cumulative development include development in the Project vicinity within the Hollywood Community Plan area. Cumulative population and housing increases represented by the related projects combined with the proposed Project are within SCAG's growth projections for the Hollywood Community Plan area and the City as a whole for the Plan's planning horizon and would not result in cumulatively significant impacts with respect to growth in these areas. The Project's incremental contribution to growth would be less than cumulatively considerable, and therefore would not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact with respect to growth projections.			
4.I.1 Public Services – Fire Protection and Emergency Medical Services			
Impact Statement Fire-1: The Project would not require the addition of a new fire station or the expansion, consolidation, or relocation of an existing fire station to maintain service due to compliance with State and City regulatory requirements and guidelines that address emergency response times, emergency access, fire flow, and fire safety as well as the implementation of Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features related to traffic management.	Not applicable.	See Mitigation Measures TR-1 and TR-2.	Less than Significant after Mitigation.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
Impacts would be less than significant.			
4.I.2 Public Services – Police Protection			
Impact Statement POL-1: The Project would not require the addition of a new police facility or the expansion, consolidation, or relocation of an existing police facility to maintain service due to compliance with State and City regulatory requirements as well as the implementation of project design features related to traffic management. Impacts would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	Mitigation Measure POL-1: Prior to issuance of building permits, the Project applicant shall consult with the LAPD Crime Prevention Unit regarding incorporation of CPTED techniques into the Project design in order to minimize potential criminal activity at the Project Site.	Less than Significant after Mitigation.
4.I.3 Public Services – Parks and Recreation			
Construction Impacts			
Impact Statement PRK-1: Impacts due to construction would be less than significant. There are no parks in the vicinity of the Project Site that would be physically affected by Project construction.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
Operational Impacts			
Impact Statement PRK-2: The Project would add new residential population to the Project area, which would increase the demand for park services. The Project would include recreation amenities that would reduce the use of parks by residents, but would not meet the City's long-range standard of ten acres of	Not applicable.	Mitigation Measure PRK-1: In the event that the Project's amenities do not provide sufficient credit against the Project's land dedication and/or in lieu fee requirement, the Applicant shall do one or more of the following: (1) dedicate additional parkland to meet the requirements of Los Angeles Municipal Code Section 17.12; (2) pay in-lieu fees	Less than Significant after Mitigation.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
parkland per 1,000 residents or the short-range standard of two acres per 1,000 residents. The Project's recreational amenities would not satisfy the PRP's short- or long-range parkland provision standards, and thus impacts would be considered potentially significant.		for any land dedication requirement shortfall; or (3) provide on-site improvements equivalent in value to said in-lieu fees.	
Impact Statement PRK-3: Impacts would be less than significant. The Project's on-site facilities would be located within the building envelope of the Project generally, as analyzed elsewhere in this Draft EIR. The Project does not include off-site park facilities.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
Cumulative			
Impact Statement PRK-4: The Project in combination with related projects would add new residential population to the Project area, which would increase the demand for park services. However, these related Projects would be required comply with LAMC requirements or similar requirements of the City of West Hollywood. Compliance with applicable mitigation measures and applicable City of West Hollywood requirements would reduce cumulative impacts to parks and recreational facilities to less than significant.	Not applicable.	See Mitigation Measure PRK-1.	Less than Significant after Mitigation.
4.I.4 Public Services - Libraries			
Impact Statement LIB-1: The Project	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
<p>could add new residential population to the Project area, which would increase the demand for library services. However, there is sufficient capacity to accommodate that demand within the existing public libraries serving the Project. In addition, the Project proposes an on-site 1,140-square-foot library that would be for the sole use of Project residents. Compliance with the prescribed mitigation measure would further reduce impacts on library services to less than significant.</p>			
<p>Cumulative</p>			
<p>Impact Statement LIB-2: Cumulative growth in the Project area would increase the number of people using library services. The Project's net new residential populations would represent relatively small increments of increased demand at local libraries. The existing libraries serving the Project are anticipated to be able to accommodate the increased cumulative growth in population. When considered together with related projects in the same library service area, the Project's incremental contribution to impacts on library services would be less than cumulatively considerable and cumulative impacts on libraries would therefore be less than significant.</p>	<p>Not applicable.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Less than Significant.</p>
<p>4.J Transportation and Circulation</p>			

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
Construction Impacts			
Impact Statement TR-1: The Project would not cause substantial delays and disruption of existing traffic flow, result in impacts based on the operational thresholds at intersections during peak periods, require temporary relocation of existing bus stops to more than one-quarter mile from their existing stops, or result in the substantial loss of on-street parking such that the parking needs of the project area would not be met. As such, construction-related traffic and parking impacts would be considered less than significant for all construction phases except the shoring and excavation phase. Temporary construction traffic impacts would be considered potentially significant during off-peak hours throughout the shoring and excavation phase of construction.	Not applicable.	No feasible mitigation measures are available that could reduce the significance of construction-related traffic impacts during the shoring and excavation phase.	Significant and Unavoidable.
Intersection Impacts			
Impact Statement TR-2A and TR-2B: The Project would result in a significant impact at the unsignalized intersection of Fountain Avenue/Havenhurst Drive in the P.M. peak hour in the City of West Hollywood in the Existing (Year 2013) With Project and Future (Year 2018) With Project scenarios. As such, impacts to intersections would be considered potentially significant.	Not applicable.	Mitigation Measure TR-1: The applicant shall install a new traffic signal at Fountain Avenue /Havenhurst Drive. The new signal shall be a simple, two-phase signal (one for Fountain Avenue traffic and one for Havenhurst Drive traffic). The signal shall be fully actuated so as to minimize disruption to Fountain Avenue through traffic flows, but provide a “green” indication for both northbound and southbound Havenhurst	Less than Significant after Mitigation.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
		Drive when traffic on one or both of those approaches begins to exhibit unacceptable delays due to high volumes and/or limited gaps in Fountain Avenue traffic, particularly during the A.M. and P.M. peak traffic periods.	
Impacts on Neighborhood Streets			
Impact Statement TR-3: The Project would result in a less than significant impact on the four roadway segments analyzed in the TIA in the Existing (Year 2013) With Project and Future (Year 2018) With Project scenarios. Therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
Regional Traffic Analysis			
Impact Statement TR-4: Project-generated traffic would be below the CMP's 50-trip threshold at the CMP intersections. In addition, the Project's trip additions to any segment of the US-101 would be less than the CMP's 150-trip threshold. Therefore, no further analysis is necessary and no significant impact to regional facilities would occur.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	No impact.
Public Transit			
Impact Statement TR-5: The Project would have a nominal increase in transit ridership. Therefore, transit-related impacts to existing bus service would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
Access			
Impact Statement TR-6: The Project	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
operational characteristics, expected minimum driveway capacities, and the projected peak hour driveway traffic volumes of the Project would provide adequate capacity to accommodate the anticipated maximum vehicular demands for both entering and exiting traffic at each of the driveways. In addition, the driveways would provide sufficient queuing. Therefore, the Project would result in a less than significant impact with regard to access.			
Parking			
Impact Statement TR-7: The Project would provide 849 vehicular parking spaces, including 554 commercial and 295 residential parking spaces, which would exceed the adjusted required parking by 60 spaces. In addition, the Project would provide a total of 985 bicycle spaces, which would exceed the LAMC bicycle parking requirements. Therefore, no significant parking impact would occur.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Safety			
Impact Statement TR-8: The driveways would not result in conflicts with bicycles or pedestrians. Therefore, no significant impact would occur. However, the on-street valet drop-off turnout lane could result in conflicts with vehicular, bicycle or	Not applicable.	Mitigation Measure TR-2: The on-street valet drop-off turnout lane shall be restricted to right-turn entry only from southbound Crescent Heights Boulevard (no left-turn entry from northbound Crescent Heights Boulevard).	Less than Significant after Mitigation.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
pedestrian traffic if all turn movements are allowed. As such, impacts related to the on-street valet drop-off would be considered potentially significant.			
Consistency with Regulatory Framework			
Impact Statement TR-9: The Project would support the Community Plan in that the Project would not hinder the City's efforts to provide a circulation system coordinated with land uses and densities and adequate to accommodate traffic. The Project would also be consistent with applicable regional plans related to transportation. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with the implementation of adopted transportation programs, plans, and policies and a less than significant impact would occur.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
4.K.1 Utilities and Service Systems – Water Supply			
Impact Statement WS-1: Water demand during construction would be minimal and offset by the reduction in water consumption from existing uses. Water demand during operation of the Project would not exceed available water supplies. In addition, the water distribution capacity with appropriate infrastructure improvements would be sufficient to serve the Project. Therefore, the Project would have a	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
less than significant impact on water supply and infrastructure.			
4.K.2 Utilities and Service Systems – Wastewater			
Construction			
Impact Statement WW-1A: The Project would generate a negligible amount of wastewater during construction. Therefore, construction impacts on wastewater would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
Operation			
Impact Statement WW-1B: The Project would generate an increase in wastewater that could be accommodated in the existing system. The existing wastewater system is not constrained or at capacity and there is sufficient capacity to accommodate the Project. Therefore, impacts on wastewater during operation would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
Impact Statement WW-2: The Project would not generate wastewater flows in an amount that would substantially or incrementally exceed the future scheduled capacity of the system. Therefore, wastewater impacts during operation would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
4.K.3 Utilities and Service Systems – Solid Waste			
Construction			
Impact Statement SW-1A: The	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.

Table ES-1 (Continued)

Summary of Project Impacts, Project Design Features, and Mitigation Measures

Environmental Impacts	Project Design Features (PDF-)	Mitigation Measures (MM-)	Level of Significance
Project would generate construction debris due to removal of the existing buildings, parking lot paving, excavation, and construction of new buildings. Construction and demolition waste would be disposed of at an inert disposal facility, which has sufficient capacity. Therefore, construction impacts on solid waste would be less than significant			
Operation			
Impact Statement SW-1B: The Project would generate solid waste as the result of operation of the residential and retail uses that would occur on the Project Site. The Project would comply with City requirements regarding waste, such as the provision of space for recycling. With the City and County's ongoing efforts to reduce the amount of waste disposed of at Class III landfills, the Project would not exceed the permitted capacity of the facilities serving the Project. Therefore, impacts on waste disposal facilities would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.
Impact Statement SW-2: The Project would be implemented pursuant to applicable requirements that would further City objectives regarding diversion of solid waste from landfills and efficient use of County landfill facilities. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.	Not applicable.	No mitigation measures are required.	Less than Significant.