



ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

Project Title:	Lazy Acres Grocery Market		
Lead Agency Name & Address:	City of Hermosa Beach 1315 Valley Drive Hermosa Beach, CA 90254		
Contact Person & Phone No.:	Aaron Gudelj, Associate Planner (310) 318-0235		
Project Location/Address:	2510 Pacific Coast Highway		
Nearest Cross Street:	Artesia Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway	APN:	4184-015-002
Project Sponsor's Name & Address:	Good Food Holdings 915 E. 250 th Street Carson, CA 90745		
General Plan Designation:	GC - General Commercial	Zoning:	C-3
Redevelopment Project Area:	N/A		
Overlay Zone/Special District:	N/A		

Project Description and Requested Action:

Precise Development Plan (PDP) to allow renovations at an existing 29,653 square foot youth center for Hope Chapel Church in order to accommodate a supermarket (Lazy Acres Market); Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for outdoor dining accessory to the proposed market; and a Parking Plan to allow shared parking with Hope Chapel Church located on the lot westerly adjacent to the subject building.

A Precise Development Plan is required and may be approved by the Planning Commission for all development projects in the city with the exception of 1) Single-family residences, including new construction, remodels or additions thereto; and 2) Remodels or additions of less than one thousand five hundred (1,500) square feet in any zone. The purpose and intent of requiring PDP review for development projects is to achieve a reasonable level of quality, compatibility, in harmony with the community's social, economic and environmental objectives, and to protect existing and potential developments, and uses on adjacent and surrounding property. The proposed project involves an interior and exterior renovation of an almost 30,000 square foot building in preparation for use as a supermarket.

Interior improvements primarily involve demolition of much of the existing non-structural elements and construction of new non-structural elements for the supermarket. Structural alterations will be minimal since the proposed project does not involve an expansion of square feet or the building footprint.

Exterior improvements involve the installation of new façade treatments along the north and west sides of the building, construction of two architectural towers at the northeast portion of the building, re-striping of the parking lot, and installation of landscaping and underground water-filtration equipment. The façade treatments are proposed to be constructed of wood siding, stucco, window treatments, entrance and exit doors, architectural canopies, and lighting. Additional façade treatments include two (2) architectural towers, one on the north side of the building and one at the northeast corner of the building. The two architectural towers are proposed to be approximately 38 feet and 43 feet in height from finished grade. Parking lot landscaping is proposed fronting Pacific Coast Highway, Artesia Boulevard, and multiple places on the interior of the lot.

A Conditional Use Permit is needed for the proposed accessory outdoor dining on the north side of the building. The intent of requiring a CUP for outdoor dining is to mitigate potential compatibility concerns with surrounding uses.

A Parking Plan is mandatory for the less than required shared parking aspect of the project and may be approved by the Planning Commission. The project proposes to share parking with Hope Chapel Church located on the neighboring lot to the south. A total of 121 spaces will be designated for Lazy Acres, of which 21 spaces will be shared with Hope Chapel Church during peak weekday and weekend times. Based on the parking analysis produced by Linscott, Law, & Greenspan Engineers, which used a program/operations-based assessment and a shared parking demand analysis, parking demand for Lazy Acres will exceed the 100 designated spots, thereby requiring use of the 21 shared parking spaces, from 12:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. on weekdays and weekends.

The proposed project complies with setback requirements and the 35 foot height limit. Architectural towers may be constructed up to 8 feet over the height limit, provided these elements do not exceed more than 5% of the total roof area.

Existing Conditions of the Project Site:

The existing site is developed with a 29,653 square foot building that houses the youth center for Hope Chapel Church and a parking lot.

Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The subject is located at the SE corner of the intersection of Artesia Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway. Bordering the site to the east is a 10-unit multi-family residential complex. Commercial uses including an 80-room hotel, general office, a worship sanctuary, bank services, restaurants and general retail surround the site on the south, west, and east.

Other public agencies whose approval is required:

N/A

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a 'Potentially Significant Impact' as indicated by the checklist on the following pages:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **EXEMPTION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a 'potentially significant impact' or 'potentially significant unless mitigated' impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Ken Robertson

Community Development Director

Name

Title



10/26/16

Signature

Date

INTRODUCTION

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Responses:</u>				
<u>Substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista</u>				
<p>The site is located on the southeast corner of Artesia Boulevard and Pacific Coast Highway in the northeastern part of the City. Also, a portion of the site fronts the southwest corner of Prospect Avenue and Artesia Boulevard. The site is on top of a hill at a higher elevation than all surrounding properties and contains scenic vistas of the Pacific Ocean from the northern portion of the site while existing buildings across Pacific Coast Highway block potential scenic vistas. The project involves a tenant improvement of an existing building currently occupied by the youth services center for Hope Chapel Church. The proposed improvements will be constructed within the existing envelope of the building but includes height increases involving architectural 'tower elements' to be constructed approximately 38 feet and 43 feet from the finished grade. These tower elements occupy approximately 9% of the total roof area (approximately 2,700 square feet) while the remaining 27,000 square feet of roof area will remain at the existing height of approximately 25 feet. Existing buildings to the east of the site are located at elevations lower than the subject building, as indicated by the survey conducted for the project, thereby limiting existing views of the Pacific Ocean. The impacts on scenic vistas from the proposed tower elements is anticipated to be less than significant given the lack of existing views of the majority of the buildings to the east and the small scale of additional height proposed. Additionally, scenic vistas at the 10-unit residential complex located directly behind the proposed building are currently non-existent due to the proximity of the buildings to one another and the height of the existing commercial building being greater than the residential complex. The proposed building would be of greater height than the existing building, however given the lower elevation of the properties to the east and the lack of existing scenic vistas, and the limited size of the proposed height increase (9% of the subject roof), impacts are not anticipated to be significant.</p>				
<u>Substantially damage scenic resources including trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway</u>				
<p>The project site is currently developed with two buildings and an asphalt parking lot. No trees, outcroppings, or historic buildings are located on the site.</p>				
<u>Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings</u>				
<p>The project site is currently developed with a youth center for a church. The proposed project would renovate the existing building for a supermarket use and modify the parking lot to increase site permeability and landscaping in general. The renovated building includes interior modifications to accommodate the new use and exterior façade improvements. Renderings of the proposed building are provided in Attachment 1. As such, the project is anticipated to improve the visual quality of the site and its surroundings.</p>				
<u>Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.</u>				
<p>The proposed project includes construction of a new supermarket for Lazy Acres. The existing building would be renovated with new light sources including exterior lighting on the building and the parking lot. The project site is</p>				

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>urban in character, with generally high levels of existing lighting along PCH, Artesia Boulevard, and Prospect Avenue. The nearest sensitive receptors are residential buildings at the rear of the project site, however, the existing building blocks nighttime views. The project lighting will be downward facing and will increase safety around the project site with minimal impact to surrounding sensitive receptors. No significant impact is anticipated with proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The project should be conditioned to require all exterior lighting to be oriented facing downwards so as not to direct the any light beam directly towards neighboring buildings, specifically the residences to the east. 				
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES AND FOREST RESOURCES:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Responses:</p> <p>The project site is zoned C-3 General Commercial and the General Plan Designation is General Commercial (GC). The site is developed with non-residential structures and is located in an urbanized area.</p> <p>No agricultural activities presently occur on-site or adjacent to the site. The site is not classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. As such no impacts are anticipated.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None Required.</p>				
III. AIR QUALITY - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Responses:

Land use and development projects commonly have two major sources of air quality impacts: 1) pollutant emissions generated during construction of the new project, and 2) long-term operational emissions generated after construction. The activities proposed for this project are of a very small scale relative to the air basin and the level of emissions considered significant by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). None of the construction or operational activities require the use of heavy, emission-generating equipment with the exception of the demolition phase, which will be very short term in relation to the scope of the project. According to a Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by TJW Engineering, Inc. for the proposed project, the number of new vehicular trips generated by the proposed use after development, usually the principal source of post-development operational emissions, will be 816 per week.

The SCAQMD and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) are responsible for formulating and implementing the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the South Coast Region Air Basin. The SCAQMD has established significance thresholds for construction (and demolition) emissions for six categories of pollutants. These thresholds are based on their potential adverse short-term health effects. The scale of proposed improvements is not nearly great enough to exceed these thresholds.

- 75 pounds per day of Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC)
- 100 pounds per day of Nitrogen Oxides (NOX)
- 150 pounds per day of Carbon Monoxide (CO)
- 150 pounds per day of Particulates of less than 10 mm (PM10)
- 55 pounds per day of Particulates of less than 25 mm (PM25)
- 150 pounds per day of Sulfur Oxides (SOX)
- 3 pounds per day of Lead

The same is true of the project's relationship to Local Significance Thresholds or LSTs. These are thresholds established by the SCAQMD to examine the potential for on-site emissions generated during construction to adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors, such as residential neighbors or schools. LSTs reflect only those construction-related emissions that would occur on-site (not vehicular emissions generated by construction workers traveling to and from the site). The emissions they assess are therefore even smaller in magnitude than overall construction emissions and are even less likely to exceed established thresholds. Emissions generated on-site are likely to be highest during the brief demolition phase when heavy diesel equipment is in use. Although the demolition phase could last a couple weeks, the use of heavy diesel equipment will likely not exceed a few days, a period of time that would not generate enough diesel emissions to exceed LST screening levels when impacts to neighboring residences are considered.

LONG TERM OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

The principal sources of operational emissions new development projects are vehicular trips generated by the project, combustion of natural gas for water, space heating, and food preparation, the use of landscaping equipment, and architectural coatings during maintenance. None of these sources are expected to increase significantly as a result of the project. While the proposed use will generate more vehicular trips, 816 per week, the increase is not great enough to generate new emissions that exceed AQMD thresholds. The proposed use will also consume more energy than the church youth center that currently occupies the site. None of the major sources of long-term emissions will increase significantly over current conditions as a result of the project, nor will the combined sources

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>exceed the AQMD thresholds for operational emissions presented below:</p> <p>55 pounds per day of Reactive Organic Compounds (ROC) 55 pounds per day of Nitrogen Oxides (NOX) 550 pounds per day of Carbon Monoxide (CO) 150 pounds per day of Particulates of less than 10 mm (PM10) 55 pounds per day of Particulates of less than 25 mm (PM25) 150 pounds per day of Sulfur Oxides (SOX) 3 pounds per day of Lead</p> <p><u>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan (Less Than Significant Impact)</u> The project's long-term emissions are not great enough to exceed the thresholds of the Air Quality Management Plan. Because of the proposed demolition and construction will not substantially increase any sources of air pollutant emissions, the project will not result in significant local or regional air quality impacts based on the SCAQMD thresholds of significance. The project's development and long-term use will not obstruct implementation of the AQMP. Nor do the proposed improvements in any way conflict with the AQMP's underlying assumptions. The AQMP is based on emissions projections which assume land use composition and intensity expressed in local general plan Land Use Elements. The SCAQMD's CEQA Handbook states that "New or amended GP Elements (including land use zoning and density amendments), Specific Plans, and significant projects must be analyzed for consistency with the AQMP." The proposed project does not include proposed changes to the General Plan, zoning or density amendments and is not a 'significant project' in terms of its scale or air quality emissions. Because the land uses proposed are consistent with the City's General Plan, they are also consistent with the AQMP's land use assumptions and therefore consistent with the applicable policies of the AQMP.</p> <p><u>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation (Less Than Significant Impact)</u> As noted in the discussion above, the project's construction emissions and long-term, operational emissions are expected to be well below significance thresholds established by the AQMP for specific pollutants, due to the project's small scale. The project will not violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an air quality violation.</p> <p><u>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors) (Less Than Significant Impact)</u> A significant cumulative impact would occur if a project would, in conjunction with other projects, result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to pollutants for which the region is in non-attainment with respect to federal or state pollutant standards. Because the region is in non-attainment with respect to NO2, PM2.5 and PM10, there could be a cumulatively significant impact if the project and related projects led to an exceedance of these standards or contributed to an existing exceedance. With regard to determining the significance of a project's contribution to cumulative impact, SCAQMD recommends that a project's potential contribution be assessed utilizing the same significance criteria as those for project specific impacts. As the proposed project does not generate construction or operational emissions that exceed the SCAQMD recommended daily thresholds for project-specific impacts, the construction and operational emissions of the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable and would result in a less than significant impact.</p> <p><u>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (Less Than Significant Impact)</u> Sensitive populations (i.e. children, senior citizens and acutely or chronically ill people) are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than the general population. Land uses considered to be sensitive receptors typically include residences. Motor vehicles are the primary source of pollutants in the project vicinity. Traffic-congested roadways and intersections have the potential to generate localized high levels of CO. However, as described in Section XVI below, the project is not anticipated to cause any significant increase in traffic volumes or contribute to degradation of traffic conditions. The project will not generate vehicular emissions in sufficient quantities to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p> <p>Although construction of the project may result in low levels of criteria air pollutants, these temporary emissions will</p>				

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

not result in significant pollutant concentrations (see discussion above) and would not affect sensitive receptors. Temporary construction emissions generated on the site will not be significant enough to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Toxic Air Contaminants (TACs)¹ are often a source of pollutants associated with specific activities. TACs are found in ambient air, especially in urban areas, and are caused by industry, agriculture, fuel combustion, and commercial operations (e.g. dry cleaners). TACs are typically found in low concentrations, even near their source (e.g. benzene near a freeway). Diesel exhaust is the predominant TAC in urban air and is estimated to represent about two-thirds of the cancer risk from TACs (based on the statewide average). As discussed above, the use of heavy diesel equipment for a few days during the demolition period will generate diesel-fueled emissions for a brief time. These short-term emissions are not great enough to constitute a substantial source of TACs. Nor will other construction-generated emissions that might be anticipated to occur on-site.

Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people (No Impact)

The SCAQMD has identified those land uses that are typically associated with odor complaints. These uses include activities involving livestock, rendering facilities, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting activities, refineries, landfills, and businesses involved in fiberglass molding. The proposed project will not be involved in any of the aforementioned odor generating uses. Therefore, no impacts related to odors are anticipated with the proposed project.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

¹TACs refer to a diverse group of air pollutants regulated at the regional, state, and federal level because of their ability to cause adverse effects on human health. Ambient air quality standards have not been set for TACs because of the diverse number of air toxics and the fact that their effects on health tend to be localized rather than regional.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Responses:</p> <p>A-F: The project site was converted to an urban use nearly a century ago. There is not native habitat on-site that could support sensitive native plant or wildlife species. It is an urbanized area in which there are no locally designated species, natural habitats or wetlands or associated environments at or near the site. The lot slopes downward from east to west and consists of predominantly asphalt hardscape, excluding the building area. No landscaping currently exists.</p> <p>The project will not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources or with provisions of any wildlife habitat or conservation plan at local, regional, or state level. There are no existing waterways connecting the site to the ocean or other surface water body. The project does not involve development in a federally protected wetland and does not involve improvements that would impair or interrupt hydrological flow into a wetland. No impact related to movement of fish or wildlife species or migration corridors would occur. No impacts, directly or indirectly, are anticipated to biological resources.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures</p> <p>None required.</p>				
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Responses:</p> <p><u>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5 (No impact)</u> The proposed project would include a renovation of an existing church youth building as well as parking lot improvements involving minimal grading and landscaping. The existing site and building are not identified as historical resources , therefore no impacts are anticipated.</p> <p><u>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5 (Less Than Significant Impact)</u> The probability of encountering buried archaeological resources is considered to be very low in Hermosa Beach. This is due to both the existing site conditions being entirely developed and the known preferences of local prehistoric peoples to select their habitation sites near freshwater sources. For these reasons, the project’s minimal soil disturbing activities are not expected to significantly impact archaeological resources.</p>				

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p><u>Directly or Indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (Less Than Significant)</u> A moderate potential exists to encounter buried paleontological resources within Quaternary deposits underlying Hermosa Beach. However, these deposits are not likely to be encountered during subsurface disturbances of less than 15 feet below the surface. The proposed project does not include excavation or grading that is likely to encounter fossil bearing deposits.</p> <p><u>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries (Less than significant impact)</u> The likelihood of encountering buried human remains is extremely low. See response regarding archaeological resources above.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None required.</p> <p><u>References:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Archaeological and Paleontological Resources Assessment to Support the General Plan Update for the City of Hermosa Beach, Los Angeles County, California, prepared March 2014. 				

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

Responses:

A-E: The proposed project is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or other known fault. The site is at risk of seismic activity, tsunami and flooding associated with the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone, Elysian Park Fold and Thrust Belt, Malibu Coast and Santa-Monica-Hollywood Faults, Whittier Fault, and San Andreas Fault which could generate a credible 8.25 earthquake. Tsunami events can be generated by distant or local seismic activity or underwater landslides, however, the property is located outside of the tsunami zone. Sandy soils consisting of beach fines underlying the site are not expansive but are subject to liquefaction. The project minimally slopes downwards from east to west, however, there is no potential for landslide hazards. The proposed development would be connected to the sewer system and would not use on-site septic systems for wastewater treatment. All construction will comply with the California Building Code and this will mitigate impacts related to soils, seismic activity and other geologic hazards.

Mitigation Measures

None are required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Responses:

Greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project can be divided into two categories: (a) short term construction; and (b) long term operations.

Short term construction

Greenhouse gas emissions during the construction phase will result primarily from operation of construction equipment on-site and emissions from vehicles driven to and from the site by construction workers. Best management practices such as no idling of operating machines and vehicles, and use of well-maintained equipment will be adhered to during construction so as to reduce the amount of unnecessary greenhouse gas emissions emitted from construction equipment on-site. The temporary nature of construction, implementation of best management practices at the construction site, and the project's small size lead to an anticipated greenhouse gas impact of less than significant.

Long term operation

Long term operational emissions attributed to the project will come from the (1) burning of natural gas for space and water heating (2) fossil-fuel powered landscape maintenance equipment and mobile sources (vehicle trips by employees and clientele to and from the site and delivery vehicles).

(1) Natural gas burning for space and water heating is typical of commercial establishments. Hermosa Beach is located in a temperate climate region that does not experience large shifts in temperature or extreme temperatures during the summer and winter seasons. The temperate climate reduces the need for natural gas burning for space heating purposes inside buildings. The proposed project will be required to comply with the Chapter 15.48 Green Building Standards of the Hermosa Beach Municipal Code which requires energy efficiency levels 15% greater than those required by Title 24, along with other will reduce the project's GHG emissions. Emissions related to landscape maintenance are anticipated to be zero or negligible as the project proposes no vegetated landscaped areas.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

(2) The project will result in an increase in vehicular trips (and therefore vehicular emissions contributing to Greenhouse Gases), however, the increase in vehicular trips is expected to be small (see discussion in Section XIV).

(a) Less Than Significant Impact. As noted previously in Section III, Air Quality, total air emissions from the project (construction and operational) are expected to be well below emission thresholds, owing to the very small scale of proposed activities and land uses. While the project will generate emissions that contribute to greenhouse gases, the magnitude of emissions is also anticipated to be well under the SCAQMD screening threshold for commercial projects of 3,000 MTCO₂EQ/year. By way of comparison, greenhouse gas emissions generated by construction and operation of a 130-room, 4.5-acre hotel was estimated to be on the order of 1.925 metric tons per year, also well below the SCAQMD screening threshold². Because the proposed project is an order of magnitude smaller in scale than a 130-room hotel on a 4.5-acre parcel, it can be reasonably assumed that this project's greenhouse gas emissions would also be well below the screening threshold.

(b) Less Than Significant Impact. The project's GHG emissions are expected to be less than the screening threshold identified by the SCAQMD.

Mitigation Measure(s):

None required.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school??	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

² GHG emissions calculations for the 130-room hotel are taken from the technical report Greenhouse Gas Assessment for the Marriot Residence Inn, City of San Juan Capistrano, Mestre Greve Associates, 2010.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Responses:</p> <p>(a) – (c) Less Than Significant Impact/No Impact. The proposed land uses and activities would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of substantial quantities of hazardous materials and by its nature would not introduce any unusual hazardous materials to the area.</p> <p>The project would involve renovation of an existing church youth center, which, due to its age, may contain asbestos and lead-based paints and materials. However, adherence to the City’s regulations pertaining to hazardous materials and waste (Chapter 8.16 of the Municipal Code), will ensure avoidance of impacts. The removal of any asbestos-containing materials would be required to comply with all applicable existing rules and regulations, including SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Demolition and Renovation Activities). In addition, the proposed project would have to comply with California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal OSHA) regulations regarding lead-based materials. The California Code of Regulations, §1532.1, requires testing, monitoring, containment, and disposal of lead-based materials to ensure that exposure levels do not exceed Cal OSHA standards. The site is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p> <p>(d) No Impact. The project site has not been identified as a hazardous site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. No impacts are anticipated.</p> <p>(e) – (f) No Impact. There are no public or private airstrips/airports in the vicinity, therefore no impacts related to airports or airstrips are anticipated.</p> <p>(g) No Impact. The proposed project would not change alignment or access through streets serving the project site or surrounding area, and thus would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project is not expected to impact emergency response evacuation plans.</p> <p>(h) No Impact. There are no wildlands in the vicinity of the project; therefore the project will not expose people or structures to injury or death involving wildland fires.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure(s):</p> <p>None required.</p>				
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Responses:

a) No Impact. The project will comply with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements through its compliance with the City's Low Impact Development (LID) requirements which in turn implement the Municipal NPDES Permit. The LID Ordinance (Ordinance No. 15-1351) requires the project to "control pollutants and runoff volume from the project site by minimizing the impervious surface area" and by "controlling runoff through infiltration, bio retention, and/or rainfall harvest and use, in accordance with the standards set forth in the Municipal NPDES Permit. Project plans must include a stormwater mitigation plan (SWMP) to identify Best Management Practices (BMPs) necessary to control stormwater pollution from the completed project. All BMPs must meet performance standards set forth in the Municipal NPDES Permit. These requirements not only ensure that water quality standards and waste discharge requirements are met, they also are effective in mitigating the project's water quality impacts to a level that is less than a significant impact.

(b) No Impact. The project will have no impact on groundwater, either by inhibiting groundwater recharge, introducing pollutants to the groundwater, or by withdrawing groundwater from an underlying aquifer.

(c) No Impact. The project will alter the manner in which stormwater is directed and managed on-site, in compliance with the City's LID requirements (see response to (a) above). This small-scale alteration is expected to have a beneficial effect on the management of stormwater volume and water quality discharged from the site. The project will not alter the course of a stream or river, or otherwise modify local or regional drainage patterns, in a way that results in substantial erosion or siltation.

(d) No Impact. See above response to (c).

(e) No Impact. The project can be expected to result in a slight reduction in the amount of runoff from the site that would enter the storm drain system, due to the beneficial effects of design measures and BMPs in compliance with

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

the City's LID requirements. (See response to (a) above).

(f) Less Than Significant Impact. As a result of design features and BMPs imposed through the City's LID ordinance, the project is likely to result in a net reduction in water quality effects. Although post-project runoff from the site will likely contribute to some degree to water degradation, the site's contribution will be less than significant in magnitude and is likely to be a beneficial effect compared to the current conditions in which the City's LID provisions are not in place.

(g) No Impact. The project involves renovation of a commercial building for continued commercial use. Residential housing is not part of the scope.

(h) No Impact. The site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area.

(i) Less Than Significant Impact. The site is not within an area with the potential for adverse flooding impacts, particularly impacts related to loss of property. The probability of such an occurrence is considered to be sufficiently low that the risk is less than significant.

(j) Less Than Significant Impact. There is no potential for adverse effects related to seiche or mudflow.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Responses:

(a) No Impact. The project is a proposed renovation of an existing building and parking lot and does not have the potential to divide a community.

(b) No Impact. The project will be required to comply with all applicable land use plans, policies and regulations including, but not limited to the General Plan and zoning ordinance which provides provisions for Precise Development Plans and Conditional Use Permits, as well as additional provisions required for commercial condominium projects for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

In order to improve the quality of development and to mitigate environmental impacts a Precise Development Plan and Conditional Use Permit are required. The proposed one-story modern commercial project is generally consistent in mass, site design, orientation and architectural style with commercial development along the Pacific Coast Highway corridor. Commercial buildings range from single to three story buildings. Architectural styles vary from Early California, Art Deco and Modern to mixed architectural styles. (For discussion of the project's relationship to the visual character of the residential neighborhood, including historically significant properties, see Aesthetics, Section I, and Cultural Resources, Section V.) The project as proposed complies with setback requirements and the 30-foot height limit. In summary, the project's review through the Precise Development Plan process will ensure conformance with all applicable land use plans, policies and regulations.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

(c) No Impact. There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans in effect in the vicinity of the project and the project has no potential to affect such plans.

Mitigation Measures

None required.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Responses:

(a) Most of Hermosa Beach, including the project site, is underlain by Holocene-age dune sands. Although “sand, gravel and crushed stone” are identified among construction aggregate resources important to the region, sand deposits underlying Hermosa Beach are not identified as an aggregate deposit of prime importance to meet the region’s future need for construction quality aggregates. The urbanized conditions that exist throughout the City reflect a long-standing land use commitment that effectively precludes mineral extraction at a significant scale either on the project site or within city limits.

(b) There are no mineral resource recovery sites within the city. As mapped by the State Mining and Geology Board (SMBG), the majority of Hermosa Beach lies within the San Fernando Valley Production-Consumption Region in Los Angeles County. A small portion of Hermosa Beach south of 2nd Street lies in the San Gabriel Valley Production-Consumption Region. A review of the *Generalized Mineral Land Classification Map of Los Angeles County- South Half* (DOC 1994) shows that all of the planning area is designated as MRZ-3 land. The MRZ-3 classification indicates areas of undetermined mineral resource significance.

Mitigation Measure(s):

None required.

XII. NOISE - Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Responses:

The project will generate temporary construction noise. The noisiest event is likely to be the demolition phase when heavy equipment will be used. Depending on the structural features on-site, a jackhammer may also be necessary to remove concrete, stone, or asphalt. Removal of jackhammered material may also involve use of a payloader or similar heavy equipment which would produce additional noise. These activities will all be relatively short-term (occurring for a few days).

The magnitude of noise generated by these actions is not great enough to violate local standards provided such activity complies with the work day and work hour restrictions of the City's Municipal Code Noise Ordinance. Noise standards applied to land use and development projects consider the duration of noise (averaging the noise level over time) along with the volume of the noise event. The short duration of noise events reduces the overall effect of noise on the environment. Although there is a residence to the east and other residences in the immediate neighborhood, the noise impact of the construction phase will affect these sensitive land uses only temporarily and for a very brief period. The City's Noise Ordinance limits construction and demolition hours to 8 AM to 6 PM, Monday through Friday and 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM on Saturday and no work allowed on Sundays. Construction activities are not permitted on Sunday or on national holidays. Compliance with the ordinance would ensure the project's conformance with adopted noise thresholds and avoidance of any adverse impacts related to noise during the construction phase.

The proposed project includes a loading area at the rear of the building and a drive aisle from Artesia Boulevard leading to the north side of the building for delivery vehicles. The proposed loading area in the rear is designed as such that large trucks and the majority of delivery vehicles would be required to enter the site from the easternmost access point along Artesia Boulevard, circle through the east portion of the parking lot so that the front of the vehicle faces Artesia Boulevard, and proceed to reverse the vehicle into the loading area. Additionally, delivery vehicles unloading at the front of the building (north side of the building) are close to the residences to the east. Given the proximity of the residences to the loading area at the front and rear of the building, a restriction on delivery hours will be implemented limiting deliveries at the rear of the site (east side of the building) and the front of the site (north side of the building) to be limited to the hours of 9:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. daily.

The site is subject to noise from traffic on Pacific Coast Highway, but traffic noise is not significant enough to adversely impact proposed uses. This is true for current traffic levels as well as for future traffic conditions. The number of vehicular trips generated by the project over current trips is not great enough to result in a measurable increase in roadway noise (see discussion of traffic in Section XVI). An increase in traffic volumes of at least 26 percent is necessary to cause a 1 dB increase in noise. (An increase of 1 dB is well below the level of increase in noise detectable by the human ear; a 3 dB increase is usually applied as the threshold level at which noise might be considered to have an impact.) The project's increase in traffic volumes will not approach a 26 percent increase over current traffic volumes. The proposed supermarket use will have no long-term effect that would increase the exposure of persons using the site to adverse noise.

(a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? Less than significant impact. Neither the construction nor the long-term activities associated with the project will generate significant noise. The site is not currently exposed to noise levels in excess of established standards and the project will not alter this

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

condition.

(b) **Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?** Less than significant impact. Groundborne noise and groundborne vibration is transmitted through rock or other ground media and results from the use of heavy earthmoving equipment such as bulldozers and heavy tracked equipment. The project is likely to create noise and vibration during the demolition phase. Impacts related to groundborne vibration are considered significant if the vibration velocity level exceeds 0.01 inches per second at the property line of any neighboring use. A peak particle velocity (PPV) of 0.04 inches per second is considered the threshold at which vibration has the potential to cause annoyance. A PPV of 0.2 inches per second is the threshold at which there is a potential for structural damage. A threshold of 0.01 is considered to be barely perceptible by humans, but well below the threshold of incurring structural damage.

The primary vibration concern would be from construction activities involving jackhammering or other types of surface material removal. At 25 feet away from a sensitive receptor a jackhammer may cause PPV of up to 0.035, up to 0.015 PPV at 50 feet away from a sensitive receptor, and 0.00 PPV at a sensitive receptor at 75 feet away. The project will involve jackhammering of the foundation in the interior of the building, grading and surface material removal for the footings for the new tower elements, and grading and surface material removal of portions of the parking lot for installation of landscaping and underground water-filtration equipment. The closest receptor to the above activities are the residences to the east, which are located approximately 45-50 feet from the building and a minimum 55 feet from any exterior grading and surface material removal. As such, vibration impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

(c) **A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?** Less than significant impact. The project will not significantly increase noise levels on local roadways, nor will the project include uses that result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. See above discussion.

(d) **A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?** Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated. Construction noise will result in a temporary short-term increase in ambient noise levels. The short duration of noise events generated during construction, particularly during the demolition phase, will result in increased ambient noise levels, but will not significantly impact the ambient noise environment over the long term or for a significant period of time. Compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance will effectively ensure that the project does not exceed adopted standards and successfully avoids significant noise impacts.

(e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?** No impact. The site is not within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

(f) **For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?** No impact. The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Mitigation Measures:

1. The project shall prohibit deliveries at the north and east side of the building from 6:00 p.m. – 9:00 a.m. daily.
2. The project shall comply with the City of Hermosa Beach construction hours of 8:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M., Monday through Friday and 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM on Saturday and no work allowed on Sundays.

XIII POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Responses:</p> <p>(a) No Impact. The project's proposed new use (supermarket) does not include housing and so would not result in an increase in population. The proposed use will create employment opportunities or provide for the relocation of existing employment opportunities to the site where less currently exist. The number of employees would be too small to induce substantial population growth or result in physical impacts induced by population growth.</p> <p>(b) No Impact. The project involves renovation of a commercial building for continued commercial use. No alteration of homes is proposed.</p> <p>(c) No Impact. The project will not displace substantial numbers of people.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure(s):</p> <p>None required.</p>				
XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in:				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Responses:</p> <p>A: No impact. The proposed project and its new uses will not substantially increase demands for public services, owing to the small scale of the project and its proposed uses. Fire and police protection services are already provided at the site and the project will not substantially increase demand for these services. The project will have no effect on demand for schools, parks or other public facilities.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure(s):</p> <p>None required.</p>				
XV. RECREATION – Would the project:				

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Responses:</p> <p>(a) – (b): No Impact. The project does not involve construction or expansion of recreational facilities, is not anticipated to induce population growth, and will not increase the use of existing parks or recreational facilities; therefore no impact is anticipated.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure(s):</p> <p>None required.</p>				
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulating system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Responses:</p> <p>A Traffic Impact Analysis for the proposed Lazy Acres supermarket was prepared by TJW Engineering. The scope of the traffic analysis included the conversion of the church youth center to the Lazy Acres supermarket and future renovations/expansion at the adjacent Hope Chapel Church (2420 Pacific Coast Highway).</p>				

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

The proposed Hope Chapel expansion includes a 17,191 square foot expansion of the building at 2420 Pacific Coast Highway and conversion of an existing 15,000 square foot building at 950 Artesia Boulevard, currently occupied by a realtor’s office, to a church annex/church office.

The methodology of the traffic study included level of service (LOS) analysis of existing conditions, existing plus project conditions, project opening year without project conditions, and project opening year with project conditions of eight (8) intersections in the vicinity of the project:

- 2nd Street (EW) at Sepulveda Boulevard (NS);
- Longfellow Avenue (EW) at Sepulveda Boulevard (NS);
- Artesia Boulevard-Gould Avenue (EW) at Pacific Coast Highway (SR-1);
- 21st Street (EW) at Pacific Coast Highway (SR-1);
- 16th Street (EW) at Pacific Coast Highway (SR-1);
- Artesia Boulevard (EW) at Prospect Avenue (NS);
- Artesia Boulevard (EW) at Meadows Avenue (NS);
- Artesia Boulevard (EW) at Peck Avenue-Ford Avenue (NS).

According the traffic impact analysis, seven (7) of the eight (8) intersections studied operate at an acceptable LOS (LOS D or better) during the weekday AM and PM peak hours, with the intersection at Pacific Coast Highway/Artesia Boulevard-Gould Avenue currently operating at LOS F during weekday AM peak hour. The study intersections are currently operating at an acceptable LOS during the Sunday mid-day peak hour.

Five (5) of the eight (8) study intersections are projected to continue to operate at an acceptable LOS during the weekday AM and PM peak hours once the project is complete. The three (3) intersections anticipated to operate at LOS E during AM peak hour once the project is completed are:

- Sepulveda/2nd Street
- Pacific Coast Highway/Artesia Boulevard-Gould Avenue; and
- Ford Avenue-Peck Avenue/Artesia Boulevard.

However, without the project conditions, including the application of an ambient growth rate to existing traffic volumes and trip generation from 28 proposed projects in various stages of planning and entitlement, the three (3) intersections above were also projected to operate at LOS E during the AM peak hour. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to have a significant impact on transportation and traffic.

Deliveries to the site will be directed towards the rear of the building (east side) and the front of the building (north side). Deliveries will be directed towards the easternmost entrance point along Artesia Boulevard and will be restricted to the hours of 9:00 a.m. through 6:00 p.m. daily. Delivery vehicles entering the site will be required to enter from the easternmost driveway and, depending on where the delivery vehicle would be unloading, proceed to the front of the building for unloading or circle around through the drive aisle near the middle of the Artesia Boulevard frontage and reverse into the rear loading area. The delivery vehicle route is designed to limit any potential impact on surrounding off-site roadways as well as traffic flow on-site.

(a-b) The proposed project involves renovation of an existing building currently used as a church youth facility. According the traffic impact analysis, the project will create 816 new trips to the site weekly. Weekday AM peak hour trips are reduced by 5 per day while approximately 84 new weekday PM trips are anticipated. Based on the Caltrans threshold of significance stating that LOS D & E intersections shall continue to operate at existing service levels or better, the proposed project would not have a significant impact at any of the study intersections. Additionally, the project will be required to provide bike racks on-site in order to encourage bicycle riding to the site.

(c) The project will not alter air traffic patterns. The minimal increase in height will not affect flight patterns. No impact anticipated.

(d) The site currently has ample access from both cross streets with three (3) curb cuts along Pacific Coast Highway

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

and three (3) curb cuts along Artesia Boulevard. Delivery vehicles will be required to use the Artesia Boulevard frontage for access as this will allow these vehicles to reverse into the loading area at the rear of the building with minimal disruption of on-street traffic.

The parking lot will be redesigned and restriped with ample turning areas for all parked vehicles. Alterations to the surrounding streets are not proposed. No impacts are anticipated.

(e) The project alterations will not impact emergency access to the site. Existing exiting lanes and ingress and egress points will be maintained in full compliance with the Building and Safety Code and Fire Code. No impacts are anticipated.

(f) The site currently has three nearby public transportation stops at the southeast corner of the intersection, the northeast corner of the intersection, and the southwest corner of the intersection. The proposed improvements will not alter access to the site nor will alterations to existing public transportation facilities occur. Sidewalks fronting Pacific Coast Highway and Artesia Blvd will not be altered as part of the proposed project. As such, pedestrians, bicycles, and public transportation facilities are not anticipated to be impacted. No conflicts with transportation/mobility plans are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures

1. Provide a display case/kiosk displaying transportation information regarding:
 - Transit maps, routes and schedules, for routes serving the site.
 - Contact information for ridesharing agencies, transit agencies, and other transit related information.
 - Bicycle route and facility information, including regional/local bicycle maps and bicycle safety information.
2. Bicycle racks shall be installed to accommodate employees and customers who bicycle to the site.
3. Employee walking/bicycling incentive. Lazy Acres shall offer a program that provides incentives (i.e. local business gift card) each time an employee walks or bicycles to work.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p> <p>Responses:</p> <p>a) Less Than Significant Impact. The project and its proposed uses will not discharge wastewater except to the municipal waste water system.</p> <p>(b) No Impact. The project will increase the demand for water and wastewater services over current conditions at the site. However, the increased demand is not great enough to trigger the need for construction or expansion of facilities to provide those services.</p> <p>(c) Less Than Significant Impact. The site currently drains to the municipal storm drain system and would continue to do so after development of the project. The magnitude of runoff can be expected to decrease as a result of the project due to the need to comply with the City's Low Impact Development requirements (see discussion in Hydrology and Water Quality, Section IX, above).</p> <p>(d) No Impact. Water availability for proposed uses will be verified through the City's requirement for a Will Serve letter from the water purveyor. Water use will not result in environmental impacts.</p> <p>(e) No Impact. The project's wastewater treatment demand is not great enough to impact capacity of the wastewater treatment provider. Available treatment capacity will be verified through the City's requirement for a Will Serve letter for the proposed uses.</p> <p>(f) Less Than Significant Impact. The project will generate solid waste during demolition and construction. Proposed new uses will likely generate increased amounts of solid waste over the church youth facility that currently occupies the site. Sufficient landfill capacity is available and is expected to be available through the lifetime of the proposed uses (20 years) (City of Hermosa Beach, June 2014). At least 65 percent of solid waste from demolition of the structures on-site would be separated and hauled to recycling facilities or salvage in compliance with the City's Green Building Code (15.48) and thus not impact the local capacity of the landfill used for municipal solid waste.</p> <p>(g) Less Than Significant Impact. See above response.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –				
<p>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p> <p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ('Cumulatively considerable' means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> <p>Responses:</p> <p>(a) The project is proposed for a developed site within a dense urbanized environment and does not have the potential to substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal. The project will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.</p> <p>(b) The project impacts are less than significant (and in some cases there is no potential for an impact). Of the impacts identified as less than significant, none are substantial enough to contribute to a cumulative impact relative to either concurrent projects or past projects that might have similar impacts. The project does not have impacts that are cumulatively considerable.</p> <p>(c) The proposed project involves the renovation of an existing building and parking lot, on a commercially zoned lot, for use as a supermarket. Supermarkets are not identified as uses that have the potential to have substantial adverse effects on human beings, therefore, no impacts are anticipated.</p>	□	□	□	☒

REFERENCES:

1. General Plan for the City of Hermosa Beach.
2. City of Hermosa Beach Municipal Code.
3. Lazy Acres Market/Hope Chapel Expansion Traffic Impact Analysis, TJW Engineering; July 22, 2016.
4. Lazy Acres/Hope Chapel Mixed-Use Parking Analysis, Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers; August 29, 2016.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Lazy Acres Market/Hope Chapel Expansion Traffic Impact Analysis, TJW Engineering; July 22, 2016.
2. Lazy Acres/Hope Chapel Mixed-Use Parking Analysis, Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers; August 29, 2016.