



SECOND ERRATA TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

College Station Project

Environmental Case No.: ENV-2012-2055-EIR
State Clearinghouse No.: 2014061066

Project Location: 129-135 W. College Street and 924 N. Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90012

Community Plan Area: Central City North

Council District: 1 – Cedillo

Project Description:

The construction and operation of a seven-story mixed-use development with up to 725 multi-family residential units and 51,600 square feet of commercial uses, totaling up to 618,580 square feet of floor area on a 4.92-acre vacant site. Residential uses would be located within five, five-story buildings with a maximum building height of 86 feet, arranged around a series of central courtyards on top of a two-story podium. The podium would contain parking uses wrapped with ground-floor commercial uses along College Street and Spring Street (including a 37,600 square foot grocery market, 8,000 square feet of restaurants, and 6,000 square feet of retail uses). The Project includes the removal and export of approximately 125,000 cubic yards of soil for one level of subterranean parking.

PREPARED FOR:

The City of Los Angeles
Department of City Planning

PREPARED BY:

ESA

APPLICANT:

Chinatown Station Owner, LLC

March 2019

COLLEGE STATION PROJECT

Second Errata to the Environmental Impact Report

A. Introduction

This Errata has been prepared to make a minor technical correction to the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (Case Number: ENV-2012-2055-EIR, State Clearinghouse Number: 2014061066) for the College Station Project. The information provided herein does not represent significant new information as the term is defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) beyond the analysis or conclusions presented in the Draft and Final EIR for the Project. Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines specifically states: “New information added to an EIR is not ‘significant’ unless the EIR is changed in a way that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project’s proponents have declined to implement. ‘Significant new information’ requiring recirculation includes, for example, a disclosure showing that:

- A new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented.
- A substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance.
- A feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project’s proponents decline to adopt it.
- The draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.”

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 also provides that “[r]ecirculation is not required where the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR... A decision not to recirculate an EIR must be supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record.”

Similar to the Final EIR, deletions are shown with ~~striketrough~~ and additions are shown with double underline. Existing text to remain unchanged is included as plain text, without striketrough or double underlines, to provide context for the revisions, clarifications, and correction.

The corrections provided to the Draft and Final EIR in this Errata do not represent significant new information that would deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the Project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the Applicant has declined to adopt. The City has reviewed the information in this Errata and has determined that it does not change any of the basic findings or conclusions of the Final EIR, does not constitute “significant new information” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5, and does not require recirculation of the Draft EIR.

B. Errata to the Draft and Final EIR

This Errata addresses a correction to the maximum building height of the Project’s buildings. As stated in Chapter 2, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, the Project would result in a maximum building height of seven stories, equal to 80 feet above adjacent finished grade. However, further analysis has indicated that the Project would actually result in a maximum building height equal to 86 feet above the lowest point in the adjacent finished grade. The 80-foot height measurement resulted from inadvertently misidentifying the lowest point in the finished grade in accordance with the requirements of Los Angeles Municipal Code (“LAMC”) Section 12.21.A.17. With the proper lowest point in the adjacent finished grade properly identified, the correct technical maximum height of the building as defined by the LAMC would be 86 feet, rather than 80 feet as previously indicated. This correction would not otherwise affect the floor heights, massing, and building elevations, as presented in the EIR.

This correction to the maximum building height would not change any of the impact conclusions in the EIR. Only the environmental topic areas of Aesthetics, Land Use and Planning, and Noise could be even marginally affected. With regard to the Project’s potential Aesthetic impacts, the slight increase in maximum building height would not change the EIR’s conclusions that the Project would not result in significant aesthetic impacts. As stated in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR, pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 743, codified within the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 20199 et. Seq., “Aesthetic ... impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site within a transit priority area shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.” (Public Resources Code Section 21099(d) (1)). Therefore, as a matter of law, because the Project qualifies as an urban infill project within a transit priority area, its aesthetic impacts would be less than significant. Moreover, the addition of six feet in height to the Project would have at most a negligible effect on the aesthetic character of the surrounding environment, on views to or from any scenic resources or subjects of visual interest, and with respect to light and glare, and shade and shadow, and would not change the EIR’s conclusions that the Project would not result in significant aesthetic impacts even in the absence of SB 743. For similar reasons, the addition of six feet in maximum building height to the Project would not alter the EIR’s conclusion that the Project would not result in any significant aesthetic impacts to cultural or historic resources. As concluded in the Draft EIR in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, at pages 4.1-20 through 4.1-36, and in Chapter 6, Other CEQA Considerations, at pages 6-21 through 6-24, these impacts would be less than significant because no such cultural or historic resources would be within a sufficient distance of or would otherwise be visually impacted by the Project in a manner that would result in a significant aesthetic impact to such resources. Accordingly, the addition of

six feet in maximum building height would not change any of the EIR's conclusions that the Project would not result in any significant aesthetic impacts.

With regard to the Project's potential Land Use and Planning impacts, the slight increase in maximum building height would not change the EIR's conclusions that the Project would not create any significant impacts, since no height limit would apply to the Project per the proposed C2-2 zoning. With regard to the Project's potential Noise impacts, noise levels generated by Project rooftop mechanical equipment are analyzed in Section 4.7, Noise, of the Draft EIR. As stated on page 4.7-26 of Section 4.7, Noise, of the Draft EIR, the Project's mechanical equipment would be located on rooftops or within buildings, and would be shielded from nearby land uses to attenuate noise and avoid conflicts with adjacent uses. In addition, all mechanical equipment would be designed with appropriate noise control devices, such as sound attenuators, acoustics louvers, or sound screen/parapet walls, to comply with noise limitation requirements provided in Section 112.02 of the LAMC, which prohibit the noise from such equipment causing an increase in the ambient noise level by more than 5 decibels. Therefore, the Project's potential noise impacts would not be increased at any nearby receptors with the addition of six feet in height, and thus the maximum building height change would not alter the EIR's conclusions that the Project would not result in any significant construction, operational, or cumulative noise impacts. Otherwise, because the change in the maximum building height would not increase the size or number of dwelling units, or the size of the other uses in the Project, or provide for or require additional parking, or create additional traffic, this correction would not change any of the EIR's other significance conclusions. Moreover, the correction in the maximum building height would not change any of the impact conclusions in the Initial Study, including, without limitation, those identified as being less than significant that resulted in the environmental topic being scoped out of the Draft EIR's analyses.

In light of the foregoing, the correction in the maximum building height from 80 to 86 feet above the adjacent finished grade would not alter any of the environmental impacts conclusions in the EIR.

This Errata also contains one typo correction to the Draft EIR at page 4.4-28 and -29, below.

Draft EIR

Chapter 2, Project Description

1. Page 2-13, the first paragraph under Subsection 2.4.2, Project Design and Architecture, is revised as follows:

As shown in Figure 2-5, ... Each residential building would be five stories above the two-level podium structure, resulting in a maximum building height of seven stories, equal to ~~80~~ 86 feet above adjacent finished grade.

Section 4.1, Aesthetics

1. Page 4.1-18, the first paragraph under Project Characteristics is revised as follows:

The Project would include ... The maximum height of the two-level podium structure plus five-level residential buildings would be ~~80~~ 86 feet above the adjacent finished grade.

2. Page 4.1-20, the first paragraph under Project Impacts is revised as follows:

The Project would introduce new development on the vacant 4.92-acre Project Site. This development would include six five-story residential buildings atop a two-story commercial and parking podium, for a combined maximum height of ~~80~~ 86 feet above finished grade.

3. Page 4.1-25, the first paragraph under Glare which ends on page 4.1-26 is revised as follows:

Daytime glare is most often associated with mid- to high-rise buildings ... The Project would develop six residential buildings, up to five stories, atop a two-story commercial and parking podium for a combined maximum ~~80~~ 86 feet above finished grade.

Section 4.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions

An additional correction has been made in this section of the Draft EIR. This correction does not alter any of the environmental impacts conclusions in the EIR.

1. Page 4.4-28, the last paragraph which ends on page 4.4-29 is revised as follows:

In its January 2008 “CEQA and Climate Change” white paper, CAPCOA identified a number of potential approaches for determining the significance of GHG emissions in CEQA documents... In such cases, the Final Statement of Reasons provides that ~~quantitative~~ qualitative thresholds can be utilized to determine the ultimate significance of project-level impacts under CEQA, which may determine significance based on a project’s consistency with plans that contain specific requirements that result in reductions of GHG emissions to a less than significant level, which can include applicable regional transportation plans.

Chapter 5, Alternatives

1. Page 5-19, the first paragraph under Aesthetics and Views is revised as follows:

Under Alternative 2, the Project Site would be considerably more intensively developed than under the Project, with a 70.1 percent relative increase in square footage and maximum building heights up to 120 feet above adjacent grade as compared to the Project’s proposed ~~80~~ 86-foot building height.

2. Page 5-43, the first paragraph under Aesthetics and Views is revised as follows:

Under Alternative 3, the Project Site would be more intensively developed than under the Project with a nearly 37 percent relative increase in square footage and maximum building heights up to 120 feet above adjacent grade compared to the Project’s proposed ~~80~~ 86-foot building height.

Final EIR

Chapter 1, Introduction

1. Page 1-3, the second to last paragraph is revised as follows:

Similar to Alternative 5 and the original Project, the Modified Project's architectural design is composed of a two-level parking and retail podium topped by five-story residential buildings, which are arranged around a central courtyard located on a landscaped amenity area atop the podium deck. Buildings under the Modified Project would therefore be the same height as those under Alternative 5 at seven stories (i.e., a two-level podium topped by five stories of residential uses, approximately ~~80~~ 86 feet above grade).