



# 1000 North La Brea Avenue Project

## Initial Study – Administrative Draft

*prepared by*

**City of West Hollywood**  
Community Development Department  
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard  
West Hollywood, California 90069  
Contact: Antonio Castillo, Senior Planner

*prepared with the assistance of*

**Rincon Consultants, Inc.**  
250 East 1st Street, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, California 90012

**November 2023**

*This report prepared on 50% recycled paper with 50% post-consumer content.*

# Table of Contents

---

Initial Study .....	1
1. Project Title .....	1
2. Lead Agency Name and Address .....	1
3. Contact Person and Phone Number .....	1
4. Project Location .....	1
5. Project Sponsor’s Name and Address .....	1
6. Existing Setting .....	1
7. General Plan Designation .....	6
8. Zoning .....	6
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting .....	6
10. Description of Project .....	6
11. Required Approvals .....	15
12. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required .....	16
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected .....	17
Determination .....	17
Environmental Checklist .....	19
1 Aesthetics .....	19
2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	23
3 Air Quality .....	25
4 Biological Resources .....	29
5 Cultural Resources .....	33
6 Energy .....	37
7 Geology and Soils .....	39
8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	45
9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	47
10 Hydrology and Water Quality .....	51
11 Land Use and Planning .....	55
12 Mineral Resources .....	57
13 Noise .....	59
14 Population and Housing .....	63
15 Public Services .....	65
16 Recreation .....	69
17 Transportation .....	71
18 Tribal Cultural Resources .....	73
19 Utilities and Service Systems .....	75
20 Wildfire .....	77
21 Mandatory Findings of Significance .....	81
References .....	83
Bibliography .....	83
List of Preparers .....	85

## Tables

Table 1	Project Summary.....	7
Table 2	Public Schools Serving the City of West Hollywood.....	66

## Figures

Figure 1	Regional Location.....	2
Figure 2	Project Location .....	3
Figure 3	View of Project Site from North La Brea Avenue looking Northeast.....	4
Figure 4	View of the On-Site CEMEX Concrete Plant from North La Brea Avenue.....	4
Figure 5	View of the On-Site CEMEX Concrete Plant from Romaine Street .....	5
Figure 6	View of the On-Site Commercial Building from North La Brea Avenue.....	5
Figure 7	Project Site Plan – Ground Floor .....	9
Figure 8	Simulation of Proposed Mixed-Use Building Looking Northeast.....	10
Figure 9	Simulation of Proposed Mixed-Use Building Looking East .....	11
Figure 10	Simulation of Proposed Ground Floor Entry along North La Brea Avenue.....	12
Figure 11	Project Signage (Billboards) .....	13

## Appendices

Appendix A	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment – 1020 North La Brea Avenue
Appendix B	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment – 1000 North La Brea Avenue

# Initial Study

---

## 1. Project Title

1000 North La Brea Avenue Project

## 2. Lead Agency Name and Address

City of West Hollywood  
8300 Santa Monica Boulevard  
West Hollywood, California 90069

## 3. Contact Person and Phone Number

Antonio Castillo, Senior Planner  
(323) 848-6854  
ACastillo@weho.org

## 4. Project Location

The project site is located at 1000, 1014, 1020, and 1028 North La Brea Avenue in the City of West Hollywood, California. The project site encompasses 43,316 square feet (sf), or approximately 0.99 acre, and consists of three contiguous parcels: Assessor Parcel Numbers (APNs) 5531-014-015, -016, and -017. Figure 1 and Figure 2 on the following pages show the location of the site in the region and in its neighborhood context.

## 5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address

1014 North La Brea Owner, LLC  
4700 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, California 90010

## 6. Existing Setting

The project site is currently developed with a concrete batch plant located at 1000 North La Brea Avenue owned and operated by CEMEX (i.e., the Hollywood Ready-Mix Concrete Plant). The concrete batch plant consists of a 634-sf office building, an industrial plant structure/machinery, water tanks, metal grating, and surface parking. Operation of the concrete batch plant includes the production and shipment of ready-mix concrete. The project site is also developed with an 11,906-sf warehouse building located at 1020 and 1028 North La Brea Avenue. The project site is void of landscaping except for two mature trees located along the eastern boundary of the warehouse building and an additional two street trees along the North La Brea Avenue right-of-way. Figure 3 through Figure 6 on the following pages provide photos of the existing uses on the project site.





Figure 2 Project Location



Imagery provided by Microsoft Bing and its licensors © 2023.

23-14457 EPS  
Fig 2 Project Location



**Figure 3 View of Project Site from North La Brea Avenue looking Northeast**



**Figure 4 View of the On-Site CEMEX Concrete Plant from North La Brea Avenue**





**Figure 5 View of the On-Site CEMEX Concrete Plant from Romaine Street**



**Figure 6 View of the On-Site Commercial Building from North La Brea Avenue**



## 7. General Plan Designation

Commercial, Regional Center (CR) with a Mixed-Use Incentive Overlay and Transit Overlay

## 8. Zoning

Commercial, Regional Center (CR)

## 9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting

The project site is in an urban area characterized by a mix of commercial and residential uses. The site is surrounded by commercial uses and a parking lot to the north; commercial uses and the remainder of the CEMEX concrete batch plant to the east; Romaine Street and warehouse, commercial, and residential uses to the south; and North La Brea Avenue, commercial uses and the West Hollywood Gateway Shopping Mall to the west.

## 10. Description of Project

The project involves the demolition of on-site buildings and structures and removal of two mature trees for the construction and operation of a new 34-story (approximately 352-foot-tall) mixed-use residential and commercial building with 514 apartment units and 30,000 sf of commercial/retail use on the ground floor. Apart from the 30,000-sf commercial/retail space, the ground floor would include an entry plaza open to the public, a café outdoor seating area, and a residential lobby with associated leasing office and mailroom. Floors two through six would consist of a parking garage with 521 parking spaces and 394 bicycle parking stalls for residents and their guests. The project would also provide an additional 153 parking spaces across two levels in a subterranean parking garage for the proposed commercial uses and for overflow residential parking. The project would provide a total of 674 parking spaces. Floors seven through 34 would include the 514 apartment units, proposed as 128 affordable and workforce units and 386 market rate units. In addition to apartment units, floor seven would include two outdoor gardens with programmed recreation and seating areas, as well as an indoor gathering area for residents within one of the gardens; floor 17 would include a fitness center, lounge/recreation room, and outdoor garden with seating areas; floor 18 would include additional amenity areas such as a yoga room, library, and outdoor swimming pool with a pool deck and firepit; and floor 19 would include an outdoor garden with seating areas. The rooftop would include an outdoor garden with seating areas, mechanical space including a photo-voltaic (PV) system, and a rooftop emergency helipad structure. Approximately 27,976 sf of common open space and 32,420 sf of private open space would be provided. These roof level improvements would exceed the finished 352-foot height of the building by an additional 25 feet. The project would also integrate seven billboards with varied dimensions throughout all facades of the building, which will include a potential for digital billboards. Additional details regarding the proposed billboards will be incorporated into the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

Table 1 on the following page provides a summary of the project components. Figure 7 through Figure 11 following Table 1 show the project site plan, various simulations of the project showing different views, and the locations of the proposed billboards.

## Access and Parking

The project would include a subterranean parking garage with two floors providing 153 parking spaces for the proposed commercial uses and overflow residential parking. The total depth of the subterranean structure is approximately 30 feet. The project would provide an additional 521 parking spaces for residents and their guests in a separate aboveground parking garage between floors two through six. As shown in Figure 7, the parking garages would have separate access points. Commercial patron vehicles would enter and exit the subterranean parking garage via a driveway at the ground floor along North La Brea Avenue. Resident vehicles would enter and exit the aboveground parking garage via a driveway at the ground floor along Romaine Street. The project would also include 394 short-term and long-term bicycle parking stalls located on the ground floor and near the parking access points. Pedestrians would access the project along North La Brea Avenue and Romaine Street. The project would provide respective loading areas for the residential and commercial/retail components off Romaine Street at the southeast corner of the site.

**Table 1 Project Summary**

<b>Site Area</b>	<b>43,316 sf/0.99 acre</b>
<b>Floor-to-Area Ratio</b>	9.85
FAR Floor Area	426,656 sf
Gross Floor Area (FAR and Non-FAR)	781,808 sf
<b>Project Components</b>	
<b>Residential</b>	
Studio apartments	179 apartments
1-bedroom apartments	247 apartments
2-bedroom apartments	88 apartments
<u>Total</u>	<u>514 apartments</u>
<b>Commercial/Retail</b>	30,000 sf
<b>Open Space</b>	
Public Open Space	27,976 sf
Private Open Space	32,420 sf
<b>Total</b>	<b>60,396 sf</b>
<b>Height</b>	
Above-Ground	34 stories 352 feet to roof 377 feet to helipad
Subterranean	12 feet below ground surface for Parking Level 1 22 feet below ground surface for Parking Level 2 30 feet below ground surface for the building foundation
<b>Parking Spaces</b>	
Standard	491 spaces
Compact	35 spaces

City of West Hollywood  
**1000 North La Brea Avenue Project**

<b>Site Area</b>	<b>43,316 sf/0.99 acre</b>
Tandem	148 spaces
<b>Total</b>	<b>674 spaces (including 90 spaces for commercial/retail use)</b>
<b>Bicycle Stalls</b>	
Short-Term	133 stalls
Long-Term	261 stalls
<b>Total</b>	<b>394 stalls</b>
FAR = floor-to-area ratio; sf = square feet	



Figure 7 Project Site Plan – Ground Floor




Figure 8 Simulation of Proposed Mixed-Use Building Looking Northeast





Figure 9 Simulation of Proposed Mixed-Use Building Looking East





Figure 10 Simulation of Proposed Ground Floor Entry along North La Brea Avenue






Figure 11 Project Signage (Billboards)




**LA BREA AVE**  
BILLBOARD A1 (DIGITAL ANGLED BILLBOARD) 140'-0" X 48'-0"



**ROMAINE STREET**  
BILLBOARD A2 (DIGITAL ANGLED BILLBOARD) 48'-0" X 48'-0"  
BILLBOARD B 45'-0" X 90'-0"  
BILLBOARD C 45'-0" X 90'-0"  
BILLBOARD D 45'-0" X 129'-0"



**EAST ELEVATION**  
BILLBOARD E 45'-3" X 90'-0"



**NORTH ELEVATION**  
BILLBOARD F 45'-0" X 153'-0"  
BILLBOARD G 64'-0" X 70'-0"

## Architectural Design Features

The proposed 34-story building would be designed to look like a vertical L-shaped building with wall recesses and cut-outs. As shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9, the project would incorporate unevenly layered floors, which would allow for assorted balcony placements and other overhanging areas such as for outdoor gardens. Articulated building elements include but are not limited to wood look metal mullions, metal panels, frosted glazed windows, wood finish metal canopy, and glass railings as decorative elements. The exterior color palette for the proposed building would be comprised of various neutral, earth-toned colors, including shades of blue, gray, and brown. As shown in Figure 11, the project would also integrate seven billboards with varied dimensions throughout all facades of the building.

The project would include exterior lighting on the building, in the entry plaza and in outdoor common areas for both safety and wayfinding purposes. Accent lighting to highlight landscaping and signage would also be incorporated throughout. Exterior lighting would be appropriately shielded in accordance with the West Hollywood Municipal Code (WHMC), including but not limited to, Section 19.20.100 regulating outdoor lighting and Section G-34.250 regulating sign illumination.

## Landscaping

As part of construction, the project would involve the removal of the two mature, on-site trees east of the existing warehouse building. The project would maintain the two existing street trees along North La Brea Avenue and include the planting of additional trees and shrubs along the North La Brea Avenue and Romaine Street rights-of-way, as shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9. The entry plaza along the site's frontage at North La Brea Avenue would include drought-tolerant trees and shrubs, raised painted metal planters, and hard-piped irrigated planter pots. Similarly, the outdoor gardens on floors seven, 17, 19, and the rooftop of the proposed building would include variations of planters, flexible natural lawn area, artificial turf for pets, and drought-tolerant trees and shrubs.

## Sustainable Design Elements

The building design would incorporate several sustainability elements to meet the California Green Building Standards Cod (Part 11, Title 24) of the California Code of Regulations, otherwise known as CALGreen. These elements may include, but would not be limited to, the following:

- Energy efficient lighting and mechanical systems
- Energy-Star appliances
- High efficiency plumbing and other water fixtures
- Drought-tolerant landscaping and biofiltration planters
- Electric vehicle (EV) charging stations
- Demolition and construction waste diversion
- LID planters
- Solar photovoltaic (PV) system
- Electric metering only for residential units

## Construction

Construction of the project would require approximately 32 months, proposed to commence in October 2025 and end by June 2028. The project would include demolition of the 11,906-sf warehouse building; demolition of the 634-sf office building associated with the concrete batch

plant; and removal of the industrial plant structure/machinery, water tanks, metal grating, surface parking, and two mature trees.<sup>1</sup> Construction of the subterranean parking garage would involve the excavation of 49,050 cubic yards (cy) of soil. The project applicant is assuming a 15 percent expansion of excavated soil and, therefore, anticipates the export of 56,407 cy of soil from the site to United Rock Products Pit #2 located at approximately 36 miles from the site at 1245 East Arrow Highway in the City of Irwindale. Construction activity would occur between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday with no construction activity on Sunday and major holidays in accordance with the WHMC Section 9.08.050(d).

## Operation

The proposed commercial/retail space would operate between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. The outdoor gardens would be open to residents between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. The proposed rooftop helipad would be available 24/7 for emergencies.

## Regulatory Compliance Measure

The following regulatory compliance measure (RCM) would be implemented prior to project construction to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds during construction activities.

### *RCM BIO-1 Nesting Birds*

To avoid disturbance of nesting and special-status birds, project activities, including but not limited to vegetation removal, ground disturbance, and construction and demolition, shall occur outside of the bird breeding season (February 1 through August 31). If construction must begin during the breeding season, a pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified City-approved biologist no more than seven days prior to initiation of all ground disturbance and vegetation removal activities within all suitable nesting habitat located within the project site. If no nesting birds are found, construction may be initiated without impacts to nesting birds. If active nests are found, the biologist shall determine a suitable buffer where no construction activities would occur. The distance will be determined by the biologist based on the species of bird to ensure that no direct or indirect impacts would occur. An avoidance buffer shall be determined and demarcated by the biologist with bright orange construction fencing, flagging, or other means to mark the boundary. All construction personnel shall be notified as to the existence of the buffer zone and to avoid entering the buffer zone during all project construction activities. The biologist shall monitor the nesting activity during construction to verify that the buffer was adequately placed, and that breeding is not compromised by construction. The buffer shall remain in place while the nest is active. No ground-disturbing activities shall occur inside this buffer until the biologist has determined activities can be resumed.

## 11. Required Approvals

The following entitlements are required for development of the proposed project:

- **Demolition Permit** to allow the removal of the existing, on-site buildings and structures

---

<sup>1</sup> As part of vacating the site, the existing on-site tenant, CEMEX, will independently demolish the 634-sf office building associated with the concrete batch plant and dismantle/remove the industrial plant structure/machinery, water tanks, and metal grating. However, for a conservative analysis of project impacts, the analysis in this Initial Study includes the demolition and removal of these buildings and structures as being part of the proposed project.

- **Development Permit** to allow the development of a 34-story, approximately 426,000 sf mixed-use development with 514 apartments and 30,000 sf of commercial/retail use
- **Administrative Permit** to allow outdoor dining, lounge terraces, and the pool deck
- **Sign Permit** to allow the installation of seven off-site signs (billboards)
- **Development Agreement** to establish vested rights and defined terms for the development of the mixed-use development in exchange for public benefits
- **Zoning Map Amendment** to create an overlay to the existing CR zoning district for the Development Agreement
- **Other discretionary and ministerial permits** that may be necessary to implement the project.

## 12. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required

The City of West Hollywood is the lead agency with responsibility for approving the proposed project. Approvals from other agencies may also be required and those known at this time are listed as follows:

- State Water Resources Control Board – Applicant must submit a Notice of Intent to comply with the General Construction Activity National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit
- Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board – Applicant must submit a Notice of Intent to discharge groundwater during construction and to comply with the General Permit
- Los Angeles County Fire Department – Plan approval
- Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department – Plan approval
- Utility providers – Utility connection permits



## Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

This project would potentially affect the environmental factors checked below, involving at least one impact that is “Potentially Significant” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

## Determination

Based on this initial evaluation:

- 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 to 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 “less than significant with mitigation incorporated” 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 potential 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.

---

Signature

---

Date

---

Printed Name

---

Title

# Environmental Checklist

## 1 Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

In September 2013, the Governor of California signed Senate Bill 743 (SB 743) into law. This bill streamlines CEQA review for projects located within transit priority areas (TPA). Pursuant to SB 743 (Public Resources Code Section [PRC] Section 21099[d][1]), “[a]esthetic and parking impacts of a residential, mixed-use residential, or employment center project on an infill site within a TPA shall not be considered significant impacts on the environment.” PRC Section 21099(a) defines a “transit priority area” as an area within 0.5 mile of a major transit stop. PRC Section 21064.3 defines a “major transit stop” as “a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.” PRC Section 21099(a) defines an “employment center project” as “a project located on property zoned for commercial uses with a floor area ratio of no less than 0.75 and that is located within a TPA. According to PRC Section 21099(a), an “infill site” includes a lot located within an urban area that has been previously developed.



The project includes construction of a mixed-use residential and commercial building located on a commercial-zoned infill site within a TPA that meets the criteria set forth in Section 21099(d)(1). The project is on an infill site because the project area is highly urbanized and the site has been developed with a warehouse building (circa 1947) and a concrete batch plant (circa 1962).

The project is within a TPA because the nearest “major transit stop” (as defined under PRC Section 21064.3) is located within 0.5 mile at the intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard and North La Brea Avenue San Vicente Boulevard and Santa Monica Boulevard. This transit stop is served by two Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) bus routes (i.e., Metro Routes 212 and 4), and an Antelope Valley Transit Authority (AVTA) bus route (i.e., Bus Route 786). Service intervals for both Metro routes at this intersection are approximately between six minutes to 12 minutes during morning and afternoon peak commute periods (Metro 2023). This intersection is also served by City shuttles, including the Cityline Local Cedars-Sinai (westbound), the Cityline Commuter Hollywood/Highland (eastbound) and the Cityline Commuter West Hollywood (westbound). This intersection is also served by the City’s trolley service, The PickUp, which runs eastbound and westbound along Santa Monica Boulevard. Furthermore, the project is within a TPA as mapped by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) (SCAG 2022).

Because the proposed project is considered a mixed-use project on an infill site within a TPA, aesthetic impacts of the project cannot be considered significant, pursuant to PRC Section 21099(d). Nonetheless, select impacts related to aesthetics are further addressed in the EIR for additional information.

*a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

The West Hollywood 2035 General Plan (General Plan) does not identify any designated scenic vistas. However, the Hollywood Hills lie just to the north of the city, approximately one mile north of the project site, and are visible throughout the city. Views of the Los Angeles Basin and buildings in downtown Los Angeles are generally not visible at the street level but are visible from higher vantage points throughout the city.

The proposed project involves construction of a 34-story (352-foot-tall) mixed-use residential and commercial building with 514 apartment units and 30,000 sf of commercial/retail space on the ground floor. The project would be designed to look like a vertical L-shaped building with wall recesses. As shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9, these unevenly layered floors would allow for assorted balcony placements and other overhanging areas and help reduce the visual impact of the building’s massing from street level and other vantage points. Public views include the Hollywood Hills and the Los Angeles Basin, which are visible depending on location, topography, existing trees, and the massing and height of surrounding development. No views of these vistas are provided from the streets or sidewalks around the project site due to existing development. However, views of these vistas could be provided from topmost stories or rooftop spaces of other development in the city. Given the height of the proposed project and potential for the project to be visible from higher vantage points in the city, effects to scenic vistas will be further addressed in an EIR for additional information.

**NO IMPACT**

- b. *Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

There are no state scenic highways in the vicinity of the project site. The closest Eligible State Scenic Highway is State Route 1 (Pacific Coast Highway) approximately 10 miles southwest of the project site (California Department of Transportation 2018). Further, the City's General Plan does not identify any scenic routes or corridors within the city. Therefore, the project would not damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway and no impact would occur.

**NO IMPACT**

- c. *Would the project, in non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from a publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

The project site is in an urban area characterized by a mix of commercial and residential uses. The site is surrounded by commercial uses and a parking lot to the north; commercial uses and the remainder of the CEMEX concrete batch plant to the east; Romaine Street and warehouse, commercial, and residential uses to the south; and North La Brea Avenue, commercial uses and the West Hollywood Gateway Shopping Mall to the west. The project site is currently developed with a concrete batch plant and warehouse building. According to the City's General Plan Land Use and Urban Form Element and the City of West Hollywood Zoning Districts, the site's land use designation and zoning is Commercial Regional (CR) (West Hollywood 2011; 2018a). CR designation allows for commercial activity centers that serve local and regional market areas. The visual character of the area is diverse as the surrounding buildings have varying architectural styles, massing, and one- to eight-story heights.

The proposed project is a high-density, infill development project involving the construction of a 34-story (352-foot-tall) mixed-use residential and commercial building, which would substantially increase the massing and intensity of development on the project site. The building would be designed to look like a vertical L-shaped building with wall recesses. As shown in Figure 8 and Figure 9, these unevenly layered floors would allow for assorted balcony placements and other overhanging areas and help reduce the visual impact of the building's massing from street level and other similar vantage points. Nonetheless, the proposed project and demolition of the current building would represent a substantial visual change in the project site when compared to the massing and height of existing uses. Notably, the project would integrate seven billboards with varied dimensions throughout all facades of the building, as shown in Figure 11, which will include a potential for digital billboards. Additional details regarding the proposed billboards will be incorporated into the EIR for the project. Therefore, given the height of the proposed project and potential for the project to be visible from higher vantage points in the city, project compatibility with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality will be further addressed in an EIR for additional information.

**NO IMPACT**

- d. *Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?*

The project site is in an urban area that already experiences urban lighting and glare. The primary sources of daytime and nighttime light on the project site include building and structure lighting, street lighting, and headlights from vehicles entering and existing the site. The primary source of glare on the project site is the sun's reflection from metallic and glass surfaces and from vehicles parked on-site. The surrounding commercial, residential, and roadway uses generate light and glare in the project area from similar sources as the project site.

The windows and building materials proposed on the exterior elevations of the proposed 34-story (352-foot-tall) mixed-use building would create new sources of daytime and nighttime light and daytime glare when compared to existing conditions. Notably, the project would integrate seven billboards with varied dimensions throughout all facades of the building, as shown in Figure 11, which will include a potential for digital billboards. Additional details regarding the proposed billboards will be incorporated into the EIR for the project. However, exterior lighting would be appropriately shielded in accordance with the WHMC, including but not limited to, Section 19.20.100 regulating outdoor lighting and Section G-34.250 regulating sign illumination. Nonetheless, the project's lighting and glare upon surrounding development will be further addressed in an EIR for additional information.

**NO IMPACT**

## 2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on 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"/>

- 
- a. *Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and*
  - b. *Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?*
  - c. *Would the project 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))?*



- d. *Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*
- e. *Would the project 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?*

According to the California Department of Conservation’s (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) and Williamson Act Maps, the project site is located on land designated as “Urban and Built-Up Land” and “non-enrolled land.” These designations refer to land not mapped as farmland and/or not in proximity to any regional farmland, and land not currently enrolled in the Williamson Act because it is not mapped under the FMMP (California DOC 2022a; 2022b). According to the City’s General Plan Land Use and Urban Form Element and the City of West Hollywood Zoning Districts, the site’s land use designation and zoning is CR (West Hollywood 2011; 2018a). The project site has been developed and is not in current use for agricultural purposes, nor is the site zoned for future agricultural use. The site is not adjacent to agricultural land or forest land and the proposed project would not involve development that could result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses. For these reasons, the project would have no impact with respect to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to a non-agricultural use, no conflicts with agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts would occur, the project would not convert forest land to non-forest use and would not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use. No impact would occur and further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT**

### 3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 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?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	■	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*
- b. *Would the project 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?*

The project site is in the South Coast Air Basin (the Basin), which is under the jurisdiction of the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The local air quality management agency is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that applicable air quality standards are met, and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards. The SCAQMD has adopted an Air Quality Management Plan that provides a strategy for the attainment of state and federal air quality standards.

The project site is currently developed with an 11,906-sf warehouse building and a concrete batch plant consisting of a 634-sf office building, an industrial plant structure/machinery, water tanks, metal grating, and surface parking. Existing uses generate vehicle trips that currently contribute to mobile air pollutant emissions. Construction of the proposed project would introduce new commercial and residential square footage at the project site, which would increase employee and resident numbers and associated vehicle trips. Furthermore, the project would require excavation and export of an estimated 56,407 cy of soil during construction to increase the vertical capacity of the existing foundations and construct the subterranean parking garage. The vehicle trips associated with construction of the proposed project would generate short-term air pollutant emissions.

The proposed project and associated vehicle trips would generate both short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions, which could result in significant impacts. Emissions have the potential to contribute to an existing air quality violation or cumulatively considerable net

increases of criteria pollutants for which that region is in non-attainment. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*c. Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

Certain population groups, such as children, the elderly, and people with health problems, are considered particularly sensitive to air pollution. Sensitive receptors include land uses that are more likely to be used by these population groups. Sensitive receptors include health care facilities, retirement homes, school and playground facilities, and residential areas.

The proposed project would have a significant impact if it exposed sensitive receptors to substantial levels of toxic air contaminants (TAC). TAC emissions are mostly associated with industrial sources as well as with diesel exhaust. Construction of the project would involve heavy truck usage associated with material deliveries and soil export. Operation of a mixed-use commercial and residential building would not typically emit substantial levels of TACs; however, the project may involve heavy truck usage associated with deliveries and trash hauling. As discussed under subparts *a.* and *b.* of this section, the proposed project would generate temporary air pollutant emissions associated with construction, as well as long-term operational emissions, which could result in significant impacts that would include exposing sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, impacts to surrounding sensitive receptors would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*d. Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

Construction activities associated with the proposed project could generate odorous emissions from diesel exhaust generated by construction equipment. However, due to the temporary nature of such emissions and the highly diffusive properties of diesel exhaust, nearby receptors would not be substantially affected by diesel exhaust odors associated with project construction. Therefore, objectionable odor impacts associated with construction of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Commercial/retail uses have the potential to generate odors, such as those associated with cooking and food preparation. Although specific commercial/retail uses are not known at this time, cooking and food preparation odors are not typically offensive and potential solid waste generated would be stored in designated areas and containers away from frequent contact with the public. In addition, commercial/retail uses are typically required to have ventilation systems that would address substantial odors. Moreover, commercial/retail uses and residential uses are not listed or identified as land uses associated with odor complaints by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) that require analysis of odor impacts (CARB 2005). Substantial objectionable odors are normally associated with uses such as agriculture, wastewater treatment, industrial facilities, or landfills.

In addition, the construction and operation of the project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 402, which provides that a person shall not discharge from any source whatsoever such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance (such as an odor), or annoyance to any considerable number of persons or to the public, or which endanger the comfort, repose, health or safety of any such persons or the public, or which cause, or have a natural

tendency to cause, injury or damage to business or property.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

---

<sup>2</sup> SCAQMD, Rule 402, Nuisance, adopted May 7, 1976.



*This page intentionally left blank.*

# 4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

- a. *Would the project 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

Special-status species are those plants and animals: 1) listed, proposed for listing, or candidates for listing as Threatened or Endangered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service under the Federal Endangered Species Act; 2) listed or proposed for listing as Rare, Threatened, or Endangered by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA); 3) recognized as Species of Special Concern by the CDFW; 4) afforded protection under Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and/or California Fish and Game Code; and 5) occurring on lists 1 and 2 of the CDFW California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) system per the following definitions (California Native Plant Society 2023):

- **List 1A** = Plants presumed extinct in California
- **List 1B.1** = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere; seriously endangered in California (over 80 percent of occurrences threatened/high degree and immediacy of threat)
- **List 1B.2** = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere; fairly endangered in California (20-80 percent occurrences threatened)
- **List 1B.3** = Rare or endangered in California and elsewhere, not very endangered in California (<20 percent of occurrences threatened or no current threats known)
- **List 2** = Rare, threatened or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere

In addition, special-status species are ranked globally (G) and Subnationally (S) 1 through 5:

- **G1 or S1** – Critically Imperiled Globally or Subnationally (state)
- **G2 or S2** – Imperiled Globally or Subnationally (state)
- **G3 or S3** – Vulnerable to extirpation or extinction Globally or Subnationally (state)
- **G4 or S4** – Apparently secure Globally or Subnationally (state)
- **G5 or S5** – Secure Globally or Subnationally (state)
- ? – Inexact Numeric Rank
- **T** – Intraspecific Taxon (subspecies, varieties, and other designations below the level of species)
- **Q** – Questionable taxonomy that may reduce conservation priority

The project site is in an urban area and is currently developed with a 11,906-sf warehouse building and a concrete batch plant consisting of a 634-sf office building, an industrial plant structure/machinery, water tanks, metal grating, and surface parking, as shown in Figure 3 through Figure 6. The site does not contain native biological habitat and vegetation and special status species are not likely to be found on or around the project site.

As part of construction, the project would involve removal of the two mature, on-site trees east of the existing warehouse building and would maintain the two existing street trees along North La Brea Avenue. Removal of the two on-site trees would not be subject to replacement requirements on a 1:1 ratio in accordance with WHMC Section 11.36.040. Nonetheless, the project would include the planting of additional trees and shrubs along the North La Brea Avenue and Romain Street rights-of-way. It is not anticipated that special status species or other protected species, such as migratory birds, dwell in the existing trees to be removed; however, there is always the potential that local nesting birds could use the existing trees to nest especially if construction occurs during

nesting season. Bird species are afforded protection under the federal MBTA (16 United States Code Section 703-711). Therefore, the proposed project has the potential to affect migratory and other bird species if construction activities occur during the nesting season, which is typically February 1 through August 31. Construction-related disturbances could result in nest abandonment or premature fledging of the young. Given this potential, impacts would be considered significant without mitigation. As a result, the project plans include Regulatory Compliance Measure BIO-1 to reduce potential impacts to on-site nesting birds to a less than significant level by requiring the provision of buffers from any identified active bird nests during construction. With adherence to RCM BIO-1 (Nesting Birds), impacts would be less than significant further analysis is not warranted.

#### **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- b. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

As described in subpart a. of this section, the project site is in an urban area and is currently developed with a 11,906-sf warehouse building and a concrete batch plant an industrial cement manufacturing plant consisting of a 634-sf office building, an industrial plant structure/machinery, water tanks, metal grating, and surface parking, as shown in Figure 3 through Figure 6. The project site is void of landscaping except for two mature trees located along the eastern boundary of the warehouse building, which would be removed, and an additional two street trees along the North La Brea Avenue right-of-way, which would be maintained. Although the trees to be removed are not anticipated to serve as biological habitat, it is possible that local birds may use these trees to nest and would be disturbed during project construction. However, with implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measure BIO-1, impacts to potentially nesting birds would be less than significant.

In addition, the project site is not near any identified critical habitat areas for endangered or threatened species per the USFWS critical habitat mapper (USFWS 2023) or any habitat area identified in the City of West Hollywood General Plan Final EIR (West Hollywood 2010). Therefore, the proposed project would also not result in removal of any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community. Overall impacts would be less than significant and further analysis is not warranted.

#### **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- c. *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

The project site is in an urban area, which is not located on or in the vicinity of a federally protected wetland (USFWS 2022). No impact would occur, and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

#### **NO IMPACT**



- d. *Would the project 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?*

As described in subpart *b.* of this section, there is no identified native biological habitat on or around the project site. West Hollywood is not recognized as an existing or proposed Significant Ecological Area that links migratory wildlife populations, as designated by the County of Los Angeles (West Hollywood 2010). No impact would occur, and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT**

- e. *Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

No local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance, apply to the project site. As part of construction, the project would involve removal of the two mature, on-site trees east of the existing warehouse building and would maintain the two existing street trees along North La Brea Avenue. Removal of the two on-site trees would not be subject to replacement requirements on a 1:1 ratio in accordance with WHMC Section 11.36.040. Nonetheless, the project would include the of planting additional trees and shrubs along the North La Brea Avenue and Romain Street rights-of-way. Impacts related to local biological resource policies or other regulations and ordinances governing tree preservation would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- f. *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

The project site is not located in an area that is subject to an adopted conservation plan (West Hollywood 2010). No impact would occur, and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT**

# 5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

CEQA requires a lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on historical resources (PRC Section 21084.1) and tribal cultural resources (PRC Section 21074 [a][1][A]-[B]). Tribal cultural resources are discussed in Section 18 of this Initial Study.

A historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); a resource included in a local register of historical resources; or any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript that a lead agency determines to be historically significant (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5[a][1-3]).

A resource shall be considered historically significant if it:

1. Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage
2. Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past
3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or
4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history

In addition, if it can be demonstrated that a project would cause damage to a unique archaeological resource, the lead agency may require reasonable efforts be made to permit any or all of these resources to be preserved in place or left in an undisturbed state. To the extent that resources cannot be left undisturbed, mitigation measures are required (PRC Section 21083.2[a], [b]).

PRC Section 21083.2(g) defines a unique archaeological resource as an archaeological artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it:

1. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information;

2. Has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type; or
  3. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.
- a. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*

The City's Cultural Heritage Preservation Ordinance (WHMC Chapter 19.58 Article 19-4) authorizes the Historic Preservation Commission to approve a nomination application for and recommend the designation of a cultural resource to the City Council. The Council may designate a cultural resource, or any portion thereof (both interior and exterior), or a historic district by the procedures outlined in the ordinance. An eligible property may be nominated and designated as a cultural resource if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- A. **Exemplifies Special Elements of the City.** It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city's aesthetic, architectural, cultural, economic, engineering, political, natural, or social history and possesses integrity of design, location, materials, setting, workmanship feeling, and association in any of the following ways:
  1. It embodies distinctive characteristics of a period, method, style, or type of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.
  2. It contributes to the significance of a historic area by being:
    - a. A geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties
    - b. A thematically related grouping of properties which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically by plan or physical development
  3. It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of growth and settlement, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of community or park planning.
  4. It embodies elements of architectural design, craftsmanship, detail, or materials that represent a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation.
  5. It has a unique location or singular physical characteristic or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the city.
- B. **Example of Distinguishing Characteristics.** It is one of the few remaining examples in the city, region, state, or nation, possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historical type or specimen.
- C. **Identified with Persons or Events.** It is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history.
- D. **Notable Work.** It is representative of the work of a notable architect, builder, or designer.

The project would include demolition of the 11,906-sf warehouse building; demolition of the 634-sf office building associated with the concrete batch plant; and removal of the industrial plant structure/machinery, water tanks, metal grating, surface parking, and two mature trees. It is estimated that the existing warehouse building was constructed in 1947 and the concrete batch plant was constructed in 1962. Due to the age of these properties that would be demolished as part

of the project, further investigation evaluating the buildings for local, State, and federal significance is required to determine potential impacts to historic resources. Therefore, the project has the potential to impact historic resources and this issue will be further discussed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- b. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?*
- c. Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?*

Although the project area has been developed for over 60 years, there is potential for archeological resources and/or human remains to exist below the ground surface of the project area, which could be disturbed by grading and excavation activities associated with construction of the subterranean parking garage. Therefore, the proposed project has the potential to impact archaeological resources or human remains and this issue will be further discussed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**



*This page intentionally left blank.*

# 6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? | ■ | □ | □ | □ |
| b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?   | ■ | □ | □ | □ |

- a. *Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*
- b. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

The construction activities, daily operational activities, and mobile sources (vehicle use) associated with the proposed project would generate energy demand. Construction of the project is estimated to occur over approximately 32 months. Project-related construction energy demand would be confined to this period, which would be relatively short in relation to the overall life of the proposed project. It is reasonable to assume that construction equipment would be maintained to applicable standards, and construction activity and associated fuel consumption and energy use would be temporary and typical of similar-sized construction projects in the region. Furthermore, in the interest of cost efficiency, construction contractors would not utilize fuel in a manner that is wasteful or unnecessary. Operational energy use (electricity and natural gas) and transportation (petroleum) would continue for the life of the project. Operation of the project would represent an intensification of uses compared to existing uses on the site, and therefore, would likely result in increased energy and fuel demand.

To fully and accurately account for the proposed project’s energy demands in all the above categories, the project’s emissions will be modeled based on details related to construction schedule, construction equipment, and building materials, as well as energy use during operation and transportation emissions based on the results of a project-specific transportation analysis (see Section 17, *Transportation*). In addition, consideration of any proposed sustainable design features will be incorporated into the models and estimates. To understand how the project would consume energy resources and comply or conflict with a plan for renewable energy, these issues will be further evaluated in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# 7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
1. 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?	■	□	■	□
2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	■	□	■	□
3. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	□	□	■	□
4. Landslides?	□	□	■	□
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	□	□	■	□
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?	■	□	□	□
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	■	□	□	□
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	□	□	□	■
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	■	□	□	□

A Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation was prepared by Geocon West Inc. for the project in May of 2023 (Geocon West, Inc. 2023). The following analysis is based on the information and analysis contained in the project-specific Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation.

*a.1. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving 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?*

The project site is in the seismically active Southern California region; however, according to the California DOC, the project site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone or a designated Fault Precaution Zone (California DOC 2021a). The closest Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone is the Hollywood Fault Zone, which is located approximately one mile north of the project site (Geocon West, Inc. 2023).

To reduce geologic and seismic impacts, the City's General Plan Safety and Noise Element includes goals, objectives, and policies intended to reduce death, injuries, damage to property, and economic and social dislocation due to earthquakes and related geologic hazards (West Hollywood 2020). In addition, the project would comply with Title 24 of the 2022 CBC, which establishes minimum standards to safeguard the public health, safety, and general welfare through structural strength, means of egress, and general stability by regulating and controlling the design, construction, quality of materials, use and occupancy, location, and maintenance of all building and structures within its jurisdiction. The impact to people, buildings, or structures from fault rupture would be reduced by the required conformance with applicable building codes and accepted engineering practices. Although the project is located one mile from the nearest Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone, geotechnical investigations and identification of project-specific engineering practices are ongoing. Therefore, this impact will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*a.2. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking?*

As discussed under subpart *a.1.* of this section, the project site is situated in the seismically active Southern California region and is therefore susceptible to ground shaking during a seismic event. The closest surface trace of an active fault to the site is the Hollywood Fault located approximately one mile to the north. Other nearby active faults include but are not limited to the Newport-Inglewood Fault Zone, the Santa Monica Fault, and the Raymond Fault, located approximately four miles southwest, 4.4 miles northwest, and 7.3 miles east-northeast of the site, respectively (Geocon West, Inc. 2023). The project site could be subject to strong seismic ground shaking; however, this effect is common in Southern California and is addressed through compliance with Title 24 of the CBC and accepted engineering practices. Geotechnical investigations and project-specific engineering practices are ongoing; therefore, this impact will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**



*a.3. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

Liquefaction is a condition that occurs when unconsolidated, saturated soils change to a near-liquid state during ground shaking. Liquefaction-related effects include loss of bearing strength, amplified ground oscillations, lateral spreading, and flow failures. According to the California Seismic Hazards Zones Map for the Hollywood Quadrangle, the project site is not located in a liquefaction hazard zone. Furthermore, the site is underlain by Pleistocene-aged alluvial sediments that are typically not prone to liquefaction. In addition, two site-specific liquefaction analyses were performed in accordance with standard procedures and it was determined that the site soils would not be prone to liquefaction (Geocon West, Inc. 2023). Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*a.4. Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides?*

The geologic character of an area determines its potential for landslides. Steep slopes, the extent of erosion, and the rock composition of a hillside all contribute to the potential for slope failure and landslide events. The project site gently slopes to the southwest and the site topography is relatively level. Furthermore, the site is not located on an area identified as having a potential for slope instability, such as a hillside area. Moreover, the probability for a seismically induced landslide occurring on-site or in the project area is low due to the general lack of elevation difference across or adjacent to the site (Geocon West, Inc. 2023). This impact would therefore be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*b. Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

The project site is currently fully developed; however, temporary construction related erosion has the potential to occur during project development, particularly during demolition, site preparation, and grading activities. Nonetheless, erosion impacts can be prevented or mitigated, and construction activity would be required to comply with WHMC Section 15.56.090 which includes a project-specific Low Impact Development Plan (LID Plan). As stated in Section 10, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, the LID Plan includes best management practices (BMPs) to mitigate erosion and ensure proper management of stormwater during construction. The BMPs are designed to contain stormwater volume and flow rates within the project site, preventing adverse impacts on off-site drainage facilities and receiving waters. Therefore, impacts associated with site-specific erosion would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- c. *Would the project 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?*

As discussed under subparts a.3 through a.4 of this section, the project would not be exposed to unstable soils or soils that would become unstable from landslides, lateral spreading, liquefaction, collapse, or other ground failure. Subsidence occurs with vertical and/or horizontal displacement, which include but is not limited to the withdrawal of groundwater, oil, or natural gas or as a result of decomposition of natural organic materials. Soils that are particularly subject to subsidence include those with high silt or clay content and/or high organic content. The potential for failure from subsidence and lateral spreading is highest in areas where the groundwater table is high and where relatively soft and recent alluvial deposits exist. According to the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, the project site is not located within the limits of a former marsh and organic materials were not encountered in borings at the site and the impacts of oil extraction in the area are marginal; therefore, the potential for subsidence at the site is low (Geocon West, Inc. 2023). However, as discussed under subpart d. of this section, the project site includes expansive soils, which could result in a significant impact. Geotechnical investigations and project-specific engineering practices are ongoing; therefore, this impact will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- d. *Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?*

Expansive soils are generally clays, which increase in volume when saturated and shrink when dried. According to the Geotechnical Investigation, on-site soils at a depth between one and five feet below the existing ground surface are considered to have a “medium” to “high” expansive potential and are classified as “expansive” in accordance with the Section 1803.5.32022 CBC (Geocon West, Inc. 2023). Moreover, the historic high groundwater level beneath the site is approximately 15 to 20 feet below the existing ground surface. Based on the underlying groundwater table and required excavation for construction of the subterranean parking garage, there is potential for encountering groundwater during construction, which would require dewatering. Because the project site contains expansive soils, development could pose an indirect or direct risk to life or property and impacts could be potentially significant without incorporation of geotechnical engineering measures as part of project construction. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soils will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- e. *Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

The project site is fully served by municipal utilities, including sewer, and would not use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT**

*f. Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

Paleontological resources, or fossils, are the evidence of once-living organisms preserved in the rock record. They include both the fossilized remains of ancient plants and animals and the traces thereof (e.g., trackways, imprints, burrows, etc.). Paleontological resources are not found in “soil” but are contained within the geologic deposits or bedrock that underlies the soil layer. Typically, fossils are greater than 5,000 years old (i.e., older than middle Holocene in age) and are typically preserved in sedimentary rocks. Although rare, fossils can also be preserved in volcanic rocks and low-grade metamorphic rocks under certain conditions (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology [SVP] 2010). Fossils occur in a non-continuous and often unpredictable distribution within some sedimentary units, and the potential for fossils to occur within sedimentary units depends on several factors. It is possible to evaluate the potential for geologic units to contain scientifically important paleontological resources, and therefore evaluate the potential for impacts to those resources and provide mitigation for paleontological resources if they are discovered during construction of a development project.

The geology of the region surrounding the project site was mapped by Campbell et al. (2016), who identified a single geologic unit, Quaternary old fan deposits (Unit 4), underlying the project site, which have high paleontological sensitivity. The potential for impacts to significant paleontological resources is based on the potential for ground disturbance to directly impact paleontologically sensitive geologic units. Impacts would be significant if construction activities result in the destruction, damage, or loss of scientifically important paleontological resources and associated stratigraphic and paleontological data. This project would require substantial excavation for construction of the subterranean parking garage, meaning that previously undisturbed Quaternary old fan deposits (Unit 4) would be impacted. Therefore, this project could result in significant impacts to paleontological resources, which will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# 8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?       | ■ | □ | □ | □ |
| b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | ■ | □ | □ | □ |

- a. *Would the project generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

The proposed project’s construction activities, energy use, daily operational activities, and mobile sources (i.e., traffic) would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Project-related construction emissions are confined to a relatively short period of time in relation to the overall life of the proposed project. Operational emissions include area sources (i.e., consumer products, landscape maintenance equipment, and painting), energy use (i.e., electricity and natural gas), solid waste, electricity to deliver water, and transportation emissions.

To fully and accurately account for the proposed project’s emissions in all these categories, the project’s emissions will be modeled based on details related to construction schedule, construction equipment, and building materials; energy use during operation; and transportation emissions based on the results of a project-specific transportation analysis (see Section 17, *Transportation*). Emissions related to construction and operation of the proposed project will therefore be modeled and further evaluated in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- b. *Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

The City of West Hollywood adopted a Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (WeHo Climate Action) in December 2021 (West Hollywood 2021). WeHo Climate Action will enable the City to achieve carbon neutrality by the year 2035 and maintain net-negative emissions thereafter. Consistency with WeHo Climate Action will be evaluated in an EIR. The GHG analysis included in the EIR will also consider court direction provided in the Newhall decisions, the 2030 statewide 40 percent GHG emissions reductions targets in Senate Bill 32, which took effect January 1 2017, and the CARB’s Scoping Plan Update, which was adopted in November 2022 (CARB 2022), and other applicable regulatory developments in the assessment of potential climate change impacts.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**



*This page intentionally left blank.*

# 9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located in 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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was prepared for the property at 1020 North La Brea Avenue by Citadel EHS in February 2022 (Appendix A). A separate ESA was prepared for the property at 1000 North La Brea Avenue by Advantage Environmental Consultants, LLC. for the project in May 2023 (Appendix B). The following analysis is based on the information and analysis contained in the project-specific Phase I ESAs.

- a. *Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*
- b. *Would the project 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?*

The project would include demolition of the 11,906-sf warehouse building; demolition of the 634-sf office building associated with the concrete batch plant; and removal of the industrial plant structure/machinery, water tanks, metal grating, surface parking, and two mature trees. It is estimated that the existing warehouse building was constructed in 1947 and the concrete batch plant was constructed in 1962. The on-site buildings were constructed prior to bans using asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) and lead-based paint (LBP), which came into effect in 1989 and 1978, respectively. Due to the age of these properties that would be demolished as part of the project, further investigation is required to determine potential impacts related to ACMs and lead-based paints. Furthermore, according to the respective Phase I ESAs for the properties at 1000 North La Brea Avenue and 1020 North La Brea Avenue, historic occupancies of the site (including a used car lot), existing uses of the site (i.e., concrete batch plant), historic and current land uses of adjoining properties (i.e., auto service shop, machine shops, plastic manufacturers, dry cleaners) all represent Recognized Environmental Conditions in connection with the site (Citadel EHS 2022; Advantage Environmental Consultants, LLC. 2023). Construction of the project would involve the potential encountering and handling of hazardous materials. Therefore, these issues will be further analyzed in an EIR.

Operation of the project would not involve the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous substances, other than possibly minor amounts used for maintenance activities, cleaning supplies, and chlorine or bromine for the on-site pool. However, the transport, use, and storage of hazardous materials during construction and operation would be conducted in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws, such as the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the California Hazardous Material Management Act, and the California Code of Regulations, Title 22. Nonetheless, due to the potential for encountering hazardous substances during project construction, these impacts related to project construction will be further analyzed in an EIR.

#### **POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- c. *Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?*

The public school closest to the project site is Melrose Elementary School located approximately 1,900 feet southeast of the project site. As mentioned under subparts *a.* and *b.* of this section, operation of the proposed project would not involve the use or transport of hazardous materials other than small amounts used for maintenance activities, cleaning supplies, and chlorine or bromine for the on-site pool. However, construction of the project would have potential for encountering hazardous substances. Therefore, this impact would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- d. *Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous material 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?*

The following databases and listings compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 were checked (October 22, 2023) for known hazardous materials contamination at the project site:

- United States Environmental Protection Agency
  - Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System / Superfund Enterprise Management System/Envirofacts database search
- State Water Resources Control Board
  - GeoTracker search for leaking underground storage tanks and other cleanup sites
- Department of Toxic Substances Control
  - EnviroStor database for hazardous waste facilities or known contamination sites
  - Cortese List of Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites

The project site is not listed on any known hazardous or contaminated sites. However, according to the respective Phase I ESAs for the properties at 1000 North La Brea Avenue and 1020 North La Brea Avenue, historic occupancies of the site (including a used car lot), existing uses of the site (i.e., concrete batch plant), historic and current land uses of adjoining properties (i.e., auto service shop, machine shops, plastic manufacturers, dry cleaners) all represent Recognized Environmental Conditions in connection with the site (Citadel EHS 2022; Advantage Environmental Consultants, LLC. 2023). Therefore, impacts relating to hazardous material sites would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT 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 result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?*

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public or private airstrip. The closest airport is the Santa Monica Airport located approximately seven miles southwest of the project site. While the site would be subject to temporary and intermittent noise from aircraft overflights, the site is not within the airport's Runway Protection Zone or area of influence and would not be affected by hazards from aircraft operations (Santa Monica 2023). Therefore, no impact would occur, and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT**

- f. *Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

The proposed project is developed in an urban area in West Hollywood. While the project site has vehicular access, the proposed project may result in an intensification of development on the project site, and increased traffic in an already traffic congested area. Nonetheless, the Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD) would review the proposed plans to ensure compliance with State and local codes, as they pertain to fire and life safety, and the project would be required to comply with applicable California Fire Code requirements. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with existing emergency evacuation plans or emergency response plans in the area and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- g. *Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?*

The project site is in an urbanized area and not adjacent to wildlands. As discussed in Section 20, *Wildfire*, the project site is not located in the wildland hazard area defined by the City's General Plan Safety and Noise Element (West Hollywood 2020). Therefore, no impact would occur and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT**

# 10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



- a. *Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?*

The project would involve the demolition of the existing warehouse and concrete batch plant for construction of a 34-story mixed-use commercial and residential building with two levels of subterranean parking. Construction activities such as earth moving, maintenance and operation of construction equipment, potential dewatering, and handling/storage/disposal of materials could contribute to pollutant stormwater runoff. During project construction, particularly during the grading phase, stormwater runoff from precipitation events could cause exposed and stockpiled soils to be subject to erosion and convey sediments into municipal storm drain systems. Pollutant discharges relating to the storage, handling, use and disposal of chemicals, adhesives, coating, lubricants, and fuel could also occur. The project would incorporate PDF GEO-3 (Surface Drainage), which includes features for site drainage during construction of the project. Nonetheless, the proposed project's potential to result in impacts to water quality and waste discharge during construction are potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

Because the project site is fully developed, the proposed project would replace existing impermeable surfaces with new impermeable surfaces. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Multiple Separate Storm Sewer System Permit issued by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board for consistency with the federal Clean Water Act. This would include the development and implementation of project specific BMPs to address stormwater runoff and water quality considerations to reduce polluted runoff from the project site such as by retaining, treating, or infiltrating polluted runoff on-site. Compliance with the standards and regulations discussed above would reduce potential impacts to water quality and stormwater drainage systems; however, there is a need to characterize the project's potential effects on stormwater runoff to develop project specific BMPs for water quality and make a significance determination for potential impacts. Therefore, the proposed project's potential to result in impacts to water quality and waste discharge during operation are potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

#### **POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- b. *Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*
- e. *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

The proposed project involves the construction of a 34-story, approximately 426,000 sf mixed-use building with 514 apartments and 30,000 sf of commercial/retail space with two levels of subterranean parking. The Los Angeles Department of Water & Power provides water services in the eastern portion of the city (LADWP). Based on LADWP's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, it is estimated that local groundwater will supply eight percent of the service area's water demand (LADWP 2021). As discussed in Section 19, *Utilities and Service Systems*, the water demand associated with the proposed project will be analyzed further in an EIR. The EIR will also assess potential impacts of the project on the underlying groundwater table, for instance, with respect to the potential to encounter groundwater during excavation activities, which would require dewatering (i.e., PDF GEO-1). Furthermore, as discussed in Section 7, *Geology and Soils*, based on the underlying groundwater table and required excavation for construction of the subterranean parking garage, there is potential for encountering groundwater during construction requiring

dewatering. Therefore, potential impacts on groundwater supplies and water quality control or sustainable groundwater management plans would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- c.(i) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*
- c.(ii) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*
- c.(iii) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*
- c.(iv) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would impede or redirect flood flows?*

The project site is predominantly flat, with minimal changes in elevation. The project site does not contain any natural drainage features such as streams or rivers and is currently occupied by an industrial cement manufacturing plant, buildings and surface parking lot, comprised of impermeable surfaces.

Under the proposed project, the site would undergo redevelopment into a 34-story mixed-use building. The project site is in a high-density urban area and would not involve altering the course of streams or rivers, nor would it substantially modify the existing drainage patterns to the extent that it could cause flooding or redirection of floodwaters.

During the construction phase of the project, earth-moving activities could temporarily affect on-site drainage patterns by exposing the underlying soils, increasing site permeability, and altering the site's terrain. Moreover, construction activities could contribute to erosion and sediment in stormwater runoff. However, the proposed project would adhere to the regulations specified in WHMC Sections 15.56.090 and 15.56.095 which includes a project-specific Low Impact Development Plan (LID Plan) that aligns with the City's NPDES permit.

The LID Plan includes BMPs to mitigate erosion and ensure proper management of stormwater during construction. The BMPs are designed to contain stormwater volume and flow rates within the project site, preventing adverse impacts on off-site drainage facilities and receiving waters. Consequently, through strict compliance with the LID Plan, NPDES Permit requirements, and relevant City grading regulations, the construction of the project would not significantly disrupt drainage patterns, causing substantial erosion, siltation, or polluted runoff either on or off-site.

Upon project completion, there would be a landscaping phase, involving the planting of additional trees and shrubs along the site's frontage on North La Brea Avenue and Romaine Street and within the project site. The entry plaza along North La Brea Avenue's frontage would feature drought-

tolerant trees and shrubs, raised painted metal planters, and hard-piped irrigated planter pots. Therefore, the project site would maintain a similar level of impervious surfaces and runoff volume as the existing conditions.

Any runoff from the site would be channeled into the existing drainage system, and the project would not introduce substantial changes to the site's drainage patterns or alter the course of streams, rivers, or other drainage routes in a way that could result in flooding or redirect floodwaters. The project site would be entirely occupied by the proposed development, paved areas, and minimal landscaping upon completion, there would be no exposed bare soil vulnerable to erosion. Therefore, the operation of the project would not lead to significant erosion or siltation on or off-site. Impacts would be less than significant and further analysis of these issues is not warranted in an EIR.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, would the project risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*

The Flood Insurance Rate Map for the project site and its vicinity was last updated in September 2008. According to the 2008 Flood Insurance Rate Map, the project site is not located in flood hazard area (Federal Emergency Management Agency 2008). The project site is not located near any dams, levees, or other major bodies of water that could produce seiche impacts at the project site. The project site is located approximately 10.5 miles from the Pacific Ocean and, according to the California DOC, is not inside the boundaries of any regional tsunami impact areas (California DOC 2021b). No impact would occur and further analysis of this issue is not warranted in an EIR.

**NO IMPACT**

# 11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*a. Would the project physically divide an established community?*

The project site is in an urban area characterized by a mix of commercial and residential uses. The project site is currently fully built-out with a warehouse building and a concrete batch plant, and there is no public access through the project site. . The site is surrounded by commercial uses and a parking lot to the north; commercial uses and the remainder of the CEMEX concrete batch plant to the east; Romaine Street and warehouse, commercial, and office uses to the south; and North La Brea Avenue and the West Hollywood Gateway Shopping Mall to the west. The proposed project involves demolition of a warehouse building and concrete batch plant for construction and operation of a new 34-story mixed-use residential and commercial building with 514 apartment units and 30,000 sf of commercial/retail space on the ground floor. Vehicles would enter and exit the respective parking garages via a down ramp along North La Brea Avenue and an up ramp along Romaine Street. Pedestrians would access the project along North La Brea Avenue and Romaine Street. The project would not divide existing public spaces or extend beyond the project site boundaries. In addition, the project would not necessitate any permanent closures of streets or sidewalks. The project would utilize the existing roadways. The project would provide a public plaza on the ground level, which is an increase in the amount of publicly available open space than what exists today. There would be no separation of land use types or disruption of access between different areas due to the project. As a result, the project would not physically divide an established community. No impact would occur, and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT**

- b. *Would the project cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

According to the City's General Plan Land Use and Urban Form Element and the City of West Hollywood Zoning Districts, the site's land use designation and zoning is CR (West Hollywood 2011; 2018a). The project would require a Development Agreement to develop a 34-story, approximately 426,000 sf mixed-use development with 514 apartments and 30,000 sf of commercial/retail space, and a Zoning Map Amendment to create an overlay to the existing CR zoning district for the Development Agreement. Therefore, land use and planning impacts under the proposed project could be potentially significant. An analysis of consistency of the proposed project and its requested approvals with the applicable City land use regulations, General Plan policies (including, but not limited to, Land Use and Urban Form Element policies), and the WHMC will be included in an EIR. The analysis will consider the potential environmental issues in relation to the land uses adjacent to the project site.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

# 12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

- a. *Would the project 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?*
- b. *Would the project 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?*

The project site is an urbanized area that is not suitable or used for mineral resource extraction. According to the Mineral Lands Classification Map for the Beverly Hills Quadrangle, the project site is in MRZ-3, which are areas containing known or inferred Portland cement concrete aggregate resource of undetermined mineral resource significance (California Geological Survey 2021). However, according to the City of West Hollywood General Plan Final EIR, there are no mineral resource zones present in the City of West Hollywood (West Hollywood 2010). Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact upon mineral resources and further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT**



*This page intentionally left blank.*

# 13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project 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 type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	■	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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"/>	■

Noise is unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Noise level measurements include intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence. Noise level (or volume) is generally measured in decibels (dB) using the A-weighted sound pressure level (dBA). Because of the way the human ear works, a sound must be about 10 dBA greater than the reference sound to be judged as twice as loud. In general, a 3 dBA change in community noise levels is noticeable, while 1-2 dBA changes generally are not perceived. Quiet suburban areas typically have noise levels in the range of 40-50 dBA, while arterial streets are in the 50-60+ dBA range. Normal conversational levels are in the 60-65 dBA range, and ambient noise levels greater than 65 dBA can interrupt conversations.

Some land uses are more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. For example, residences, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, museums, cultural facilities, parks, and outdoor recreation areas are more sensitive to noise than commercial and industrial land uses. The closest sensitive receivers to the project site include the multi-family residences along North La Brea Avenue approximately 300 feet south of the site.

- a. *Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

Currently, the main source on the project site is traffic noise from adjacent roadways, including traffic on North La Brea Avenue along the western boundary of the project site and traffic on Romaine Street along the southern boundary of the site. The proposed project could generate temporary noise increases during construction and long-term increases associated with project operation. Potential noise sources associated with construction of the proposed project include traffic noise from construction vehicles and operation of construction machinery. Noise associated with operation of the proposed project may be periodically audible at adjacent uses. Noise sources that are typical of a mixed-use commercial and residential building include human conversations; vehicles entering/exiting the parking areas; trash and delivery trucks; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems. The project would also include several outdoor garden/common areas and a rooftop helipad that would generate light recreation noise and occasional helicopter noise during an emergency event. Increased vehicle trips on the roadway system would also increase local traffic noise levels.

The project would be required to comply with applicable regulations of the City's Noise Ordinance, including WHMC Section 9.08.050 regulating construction activities and operation noise sources (e.g., amplified sound, mechanical devices, commercial loading/unloading). For instance, WHMC Section 9.08.050(c) states that commercial deliveries that would cause unreasonable noise disturbance are not permitted between the hours of 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m., except for normal handling of solid waste and recycling containers by a franchised collector. Nonetheless, the proposed project would increase development intensity on the project site and generate a temporary and permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- b. *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

Commercial and residential uses are not typically associated with the generation of vibration. However, construction activities associated with the proposed project could potentially increase groundborne vibration at the project site and surrounding adjacent, especially if construction involves use of certain equipment and construction techniques that create high levels of vibration. Vibration effects on nearby uses would be potentially significant and will be studied further in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- c. *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?*

The project site is not in an area covered by an airport land use plan, or within two miles of any public or private airport. The closest airport is the Santa Monica Airport located approximately seven miles southwest of the project site. While the site would be subject to temporary and intermittent noise from aircraft overflights, the site is not within the airport's noise contours or area of influence and would not be affected by substantial noise or other hazards from aircraft operations (Santa Monica 2023). There would be no impact related to airports or private airstrips and further analysis of these issues in an EIR is not warranted.

**NO IMPACT**

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# 14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- a. *Would the project induce substantial unplanned 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)?*

The proposed project involves demolition of a warehouse building and concrete batch plant for construction and operation of a new 34-story mixed-use residential and commercial building with 514 apartment units and 30,000 sf of commercial/retail space on the ground floor. The proposed building would include 128 affordable and workforce units and 386 market rate units within 28 floors.

Construction activities would create short-term employment opportunities in the construction field, which could indirectly increase the population and demand for housing in the vicinity of the project site. However, the employment patterns of construction workers in Southern California are such that it is not likely that they would relocate their households because of the temporary construction employment associated with the proposed project. The construction industry differs from most other employment sectors in several ways:

- There is no regular place of work. Construction workers regularly commute to job sites that change many times over the course of a year. Their sometimes-lengthy daily commutes are facilitated by the off-peak starting and ending times of the typical construction workday.
- Many construction workers are highly specialized (e.g., crane operators, steel workers, masons) and move from job site to job site as dictated by the demand for their skills.
- The work requirements of most construction projects are highly specialized. Workers remain at a job site only for the time frame in which their specific skills are needed to complete a particular phase of the construction process.

It is expected that the skilled workers anticipated to construct the proposed project already reside within the region. Construction workers would generally not relocate their households permanently from other regions as a result of temporary construction employment. Therefore, construction

activity associated with the proposed project would not indirectly cause population growth or accelerate the demand for housing.

The operation of the retail and restaurant uses would require hiring employees. Although staff would likely come from the existing labor force, it is possible that all staff members would be newly generated employees, which would contribute to the City's regional employment growth. In addition, the 514 proposed apartment units on the project site could directly increase the city's population if they were occupied by people currently residing in other cities.

Based on the California Department of Finance (DOF) 2023 estimate of 1.47 persons per household in West Hollywood, the project would generate up to an estimated 756 residents (California DOF 2023). According to SCAG's 2020-2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), the city's population is forecasted to increase to approximately 42,600 by 2045, which is an increase of 7,807 persons from the 2023 population (34,793 persons) (SCAG 2020; California DOF 2023). The addition of up to 756 residents in the project area would constitute about 9.7 percent of the city's total projected population growth. That figure is conservative because it assumes that all of the project's residents would come from outside the city, though practically some residents of the project may already live in the City of West Hollywood. For employment in the city, SCAG's 2019 Local Profiles Report for the City of West Hollywood estimates the city's total jobs to be 22,579 in 2017 and estimates an increase to 38,100 jobs in 2045 in the 2020 RTP/SCS forecasts. Therefore, employment is expected to increase by approximately 69 percent (15,521 employees) between 2017 and 2045 (SCAG 2019; SCAG 2020). Population and employment growth generated by the project would be within SCAG growth forecasts. Because no exceedance of the population forecast would occur, development of the proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth and impacts would be less than significant. Further analysis of this issue is not warranted in an EIR.

#### **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- b. Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The project site is currently occupied with a warehouse building and a concrete batch plant. The project site does not include any existing residences; therefore, the proposed project would not displace any existing housing or persons and no impact would occur. Further analysis of this issue is not warranted in an EIR.

#### **NO IMPACT**



# 15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the 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:				
1 Fire protection?	■	□	□	□
2 Police protection?	■	□	□	□
3 Schools?	□	■	□	□
4 Parks?	□	■	□	□
5 Other public facilities?	□	■	□	□

*a.1. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?*

The LACFD provides fire protection and emergency medical services for the City of West Hollywood, which is within LACFD’s Battalion 1 service area. The LACFD operates six fire stations within the Battalion 1 area, with two fire stations (i.e., Stations 7 and 8) located within West Hollywood. Station 7 is approximately 2.4 miles west of the project site and Station 8 is approximately 0.75 miles west of the project site (LACFD 2023).

As identified in WHMC Section 14.04.010, the City of West Hollywood has adopted the Los Angeles County Title 32 (Fire Code), an amended California Fire Code (2010 edition), and an amended International Fire Code (2009 edition). The City’s Fire Code is based on the Los Angeles County Fire Code supplemented by the other fire codes identified. The Fire Code contains regulations related to construction, maintenance and design of buildings and land uses. The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable Fire Codes. Nonetheless, due to the size and complexity of the proposed project, operation of the project could potentially create the need for new or expanded fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause environmental impacts. Therefore,

impacts related to fire protection services and facilities would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*a.2. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?*

Law enforcement services in West Hollywood are provided by contract with the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (LACSD). Protection services include emergency and non-emergency police response, routine police patrols, investigative services, traffic enforcement, traffic investigation, and parking code enforcement. The LACSD has established the West Hollywood Sheriff’s Department and operates two stations: the Sheriff’s Station for West Hollywood, located at 780 North San Vicente Boulevard, and a sub-station at Universal City Walk. According to the City of West Hollywood General Plan Final EIR, the West Hollywood Sheriff’s Station has approximately 136 sworn personnel and 35 civilian personnel and a ratio of 3.6 sworn officers per 1,000 residents, which exceeds the average for cities in the Western United States of 1.7 officers per 1,000 residents (West Hollywood 2010).

The proposed project includes the construction of mixed-use commercial and residential building, which would generate population growth. Therefore, the proposed project would increase demand for police protection and may generate the need for new or expanded police protection facilities. Impacts would be potentially significant, and this issue will be further addressed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*a.3. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools, or the need for new or physically altered schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives?*

There are a total of nine public schools serving the City of West Hollywood, which include Gardner Elementary, Laurel Elementary, Rosewood Elementary, Vine Elementary, West Hollywood Elementary, Bancroft Middle, Burroughs Middle, Fairfax High, and Hollywood High. Table 2 details existing school capacity and enrollment for each school within the project site’s service area.

**Table 2 Public Schools Serving the City of West Hollywood**

School	Address	Capacity <sup>1</sup>	2022-2023 Enrollment <sup>2</sup>	Remaining Capacity
Gardner Elementary	7450 Hawthorne Avenue	648	361	287
Laurel Cinematic Arts Creative Tech Magnet	925 North Hayworth Avenue	438	240	198
Rosewood Avenue Elementary Urban Planning/Design Magnet	503 North Croft Avenue	584	248	336
Vine Street Elementary	955 North Vine Street	826	260	566
West Hollywood Elementary	970 North Hammond	398	309	89

School	Address	Capacity <sup>1</sup>	2022-2023 Enrollment <sup>2</sup>	Remaining Capacity
Hubert Howe Bancroft Middle	929 North Las Palmas Avenue	1,601	445	1,156
John Burroughs Middle	600 South McCadden Place	2,048	1,375	673
Fairfax Senior High	7850 Melrose Avenue	3,600	1,637	1,963
Hollywood Senior High	1521 North Highland Avenue	1,826	1,105	721

<sup>1</sup> City of West Hollywood 2010

<sup>2</sup> Los Angeles Unified School District Open Data Portal 2023

The project involves demolition of a warehouse building and concrete batch plant for construction and operation of a new 34-story mixed-use residential and commercial building with 514 apartment units and 30,000 sf of commercial/retail space on the ground floor. As discussed in Section 14, *Population and Housing*, based on approximately 1.49 people per household in the City of West Hollywood, the project would result in the net increase of 756 residents on the project site, which may include school-aged children (California DOF 2023).

According to Los Angeles Unified School District student generation rates included in the City of West Hollywood General Plan Final EIR, residential developments are estimated to generate elementary school students at a rate of 0.1966 student per unit, middle school students at a rate of 0.0935 student per unit, and high school students at a rate of 0.1106 student per unit (West Hollywood 2010). Therefore, considering the project would include 514 apartment units, the project would generate an estimated 101 elementary school-aged students, 48 middle school-aged students, and 57 high school-aged students.

Based on the remaining capacities of the schools within the project site’s service area, the new students generated by the project would be accommodated within the existing assigned public schools. Therefore, the project would not result in the need for new or physically altered schools. In addition, pursuant to Section 65995(3)(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), the payment of statutory fees “...is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or development of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization.” Therefore, payment of development fees is considered full mitigation for the project’s impacts under CEQA and no additional mitigation is required. Potential impacts to schools would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*a.4. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks, or the need for new or physically altered parks, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives?*

As discussed in Section 14, *Population and Housing*, the proposed project would involve a net increase of approximately 756 residents on the project site, which is in line with the population growth forecast for the city and would result in a nominal increase in demand for parks. The City does not have an adopted park standard in terms of park acreage per resident. However, the

Quimby Act requires a park acreage of three acres per 1,000 population. The City of West Hollywood currently has approximately 15.31 total acres of parks (West Hollywood 2010). Based on the 2021 population of 34,928, the City's parkland ratio is 0.44 (0.44 acres per 1,000 residents). This is considerably below the ratio of 3.0 (three acres of parkland per 1,000 residents) required by the Quimby Act.

Based on the net increase of approximately 756 residents, the project would require approximately 100,101 sf of recreational space. The project would provide approximately 60,396 sf of recreational amenities and outdoor spaces (i.e., garden, lounge areas, gym facilities, yoga room, swimming pool) for residents. In addition, the project site is approximately 0.3 mile east of Poinsettia Recreation Center, which provides grassy areas, a playground, baseball field, basketball courts, tennis courts, and a dog park. In addition, the project applicant would be required to pay Quimby Act and public open space development fees established by the City as mentioned in WHMC Chapter 19.64 and Parks and Recreation Element Policy PR-1.7, which goes towards maintaining, improving, and expanding parks within the city. Consistent with WHMC Chapter 19.64 and Parks and Recreation Element Policy PR-1.7, payment of park fees would offset impacts of increase park and recreation demand. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.

#### **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*a.5. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of other new or physically altered public facilities, or the need for other new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives?*

The proposed project would incrementally increase the use of the City's public services and facilities. Impacts to the storm drain system (discussed in Section 10, *Hydrology and Water Quality*), solid waste disposal, water usage and wastewater disposal (discussed in more detail in Section 19, *Utilities and Service Systems*) will be addressed in an EIR.

A significant impact may occur if a project includes substantial employment or population growth that could generate a demand for other public facilities (such as libraries), which would exceed the capacity available to serve the project site, necessitating a new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which would have significant physical impacts on the environment. However, as discussed in Section 14, *Population and Housing*, implementation of the proposed project would result in a net increase of 756 residents on the project site. Therefore, the increased demand would be within SCAG's forecasts. The City would continue to accommodate the needs of the residents; therefore, impacts be less than significant and further analysis of this issue in an EIR is not warranted.

#### **LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

# 16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- 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?*
- 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?*

The project involves demolition of a warehouse building and concrete batch plant for construction and operation of a new 34-story mixed-use residential and commercial building with 514 apartment units and 30,000 sf of commercial/retail space on the ground floor. Based on an estimated household size of 1.47 individuals, the project would generate approximately 756 residents (California DOF 2023). The project would result in a net increase of permanent on-site residents, which would increase the demand for existing neighborhood and regional parks and/or recreational facilities. The City of West Hollywood currently has approximately 15.31 total acres of parks (West Hollywood 2010). Based on the 2021 population of 34,928, the City’s parkland ratio is 0.44 (0.44 acres per 1,000 residents). This is considerably below the ratio of 3.0 (three acres of parkland per 1,000 residents) required by the Quimby Act.

However, the project would provide approximately 60,396 sf of recreational amenities and outdoor spaces (i.e., garden, lounge areas, gym facilities, yoga room, swimming pool) for residents. In addition, the project site is approximately 0.3 mile east of Poinsettia Recreation Center, which provides grassy areas, a playground, baseball field, basketball courts, tennis courts, and a dog park. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 15, *Public Services*, the project applicant would be required to pay Quimby Act and public open space development fees established by the City, which go towards maintaining, improving, and expanding parks within the city. Therefore, development of the proposed project would not result in substantial deterioration of existing parks or recreational facilities and impacts would be less than significant. Further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# 17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Would the project:

a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	■	□	□	□
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	■	□	□	□
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?	■	□	□	□
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	■	□	□	□

- a. *Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*
- b. *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*
- c. *Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible use (e.g., farm equipment)?*
- d. *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?*

Project-generated traffic during construction would include worker-related commuter trips, trucks used for delivering construction equipment, and trucks used for delivering and hauling construction materials and wastes. Project-generated traffic during operation would include employee-related vehicle trips, vehicle trips from patrons, vehicle trips associated with loading/delivery trucks, and vehicle trips from residents. The trips generated by the proposed project have the potential to increase traffic levels at area intersections and on roadway segments and contribute to cumulative traffic increases. As such, a transportation analysis will be prepared to analyze the project’s impacts based on the City’s impact criteria. The proposed project may also result in hazards, inadequate emergency access, or conflict with applicable plans and policies. Transportation impacts are potentially significant and will be analyzed further in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*This page intentionally left blank.*



# 18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in a Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p> <p>a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?</p> <p>b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p>	<p>■</p> <p>■</p>	<p>□</p> <p>□</p>	<p>□</p> <p>□</p>	<p>□</p> <p>□</p>

As of July 1, 2015, California Assembly Bill 52 of 2014 (AB 52) was enacted and expands CEQA by defining a new resource category, “tribal cultural resources.” AB 52 establishes that “A project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment” (PRC Section 21084.2). It further states that the lead agency shall establish measures to avoid impacts that would alter the significant characteristics of a tribal cultural resource, when feasible (PRC Section 21084.3).

PRC Section 21074 (a)(1)(A) and (B) defines tribal cultural resources as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” and is:

- Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or
- A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources

Code Section 5024.1. In applying these criteria, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

AB 52 also establishes a formal consultation process for California tribes regarding those resources. The consultation process must be completed before a CEQA document can be certified. Under AB 52, lead agencies are required to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” Native American tribes to be included in the process are those that have requested notice of projects proposed within the jurisdiction of the lead agency. The City will send a notice to the tribes and the outcome of AB 52 consultations will be provided in EIR.

- a. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 that is listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?*
- b. *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074 that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1?*

The project site has been previously graded and disturbed during construction of the existing on-site buildings and structures, and no tribal cultural resources are anticipated to be discovered during project construction. However, new ground disturbance associated with the proposed subterranean parking garage would substantial excavation below the level of prior disturbance. As a result, there is the possibility of encountering unanticipated undisturbed tribal cultural resources. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be further studied in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

# 19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	■	□	□	□
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	■	□	□	□
c. 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?	■	□	□	□
d. Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	■	□	□	□
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	■	□	□	□

a. *Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

c. *Would the project 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?*

The sewer collection system in the City of West Hollywood is comprised of City-owned local sewers and County-owned trunk sewer lines. Wastewater from the city is delivered to the Hyperion

Treatment Plant in Playa Del Ray, operated by the City of Los Angeles Sanitation Department. This wastewater treatment plant provides full secondary treatment (West Hollywood 2010).

Because the proposed project would represent an intensification of use on the project site compared to existing conditions, project operation would increase on-site wastewater generation. This increase could exceed the capacity of existing wastewater treatment infrastructure. In addition, the project operation would also increase energy demand and natural gas use when compared to existing conditions. However, the project site is an infill project served by existing telecommunications facilities within the city and would not require the expansion or construction of new telecommunications infrastructure.

Impacts related to wastewater generation and treatment capacity, energy demand, and natural gas use would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- b. Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?*

Water service to the project site would be provided by the LADWP (LADWP 2021). The proposed project would represent an intensification of uses on the project site compared to existing conditions, which would generate an increase in on-site water use. This increase could potentially exceed local supplies. Impacts to City water supplies would be potentially significant impact and will be analyzed in an EIR. The EIR will include analysis of water demand associated with the project compared to available water supply in the city.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- d. Would the project generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*
- e. Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

The City of West Hollywood contracts with Athens Services to collect, transport, and dispose of solid waste for all residential and commercial uses (West Hollywood 2010). Solid waste from West Hollywood is collected by Athens Services and taken to their recycling and sorting facility, the City of Industry Materials Recovery Facility. Food waste is processed and delivered to their compost facility, American Organics, in Victorville (Athens Services 2022). Waste that cannot be recycled is disposed of at a landfill.

The proposed project would intensify development on the project site compared to existing conditions which would increase waste generation compared to existing conditions. This increase could exceed the capacity of solid waste disposal facilities. Impacts would be potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR, which will compare the project's solid waste generation to available landfill capacities and waste reduction mandates.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

## 20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is in an urban area of the City of West Hollywood and, according to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) is not within a State Responsibility Area (SRA) or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ) (CAL FIRE 2022). There are no forested areas within the City; and therefore, no VHFHSZs or SRAs within the City boundaries (West Hollywood 2020).

- a. *If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

The nearest VHFHSZ is approximately 12 miles northeast of the project site (CAL FIRE 2022). Though the project site is not near a VHFHSZ, the City's Hazard Mitigation Plan provides a Critical Priority Risk Index (CPRI) which is an equation to establish a ranking for each potential hazard based on the probability, magnitude/ severity, warning time and duration associated with the hazard. The CPRI for wildfires at the project site is 2.6 which falls under the "Possible" hazard occurrence probability

that states there is between 1 to 10 percent probability in the next year, or at least one chance in the next 100 years of a wildfire (West Hollywood 2018b).

The proposed project would not involve the development of structures that could potentially impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project site is served by existing roadways and would install driveways that would provide site ingress and egress. The proposed project does not include any new roads or infrastructure that have the potential to interfere with or obstruct an adopted emergency response plan or impede fire or police access to the site. The proposed project would be required to comply with all fire department and state and local building code requirements for fire safety. Therefore, impacts related to emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans during project operation would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- b. *If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project, due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*

The proposed project involves demolition of a warehouse building and concrete batch plant for construction and operation of a new 34-story mixed-use residential and commercial building with 514 apartment units and 30,000 sf of commercial/retail space on the ground floor. The project site is surrounded by other structures and developments. There are no naturally vegetated slopes or areas at risk for fires in the immediate vicinity. The nearest VHFHSZ is approximately 12 miles northeast of the project site. Furthermore, there are two existing LACFD stations within three miles of the site, which are well positioned to serve the proposed project. Station 7 is approximately 2.4 miles west of the project site and Station 8 is approximately 0.75 miles west of the project site (LACFD 2023). Lastly, the project would comply with all requirements of Title 14 of the WHMC, including measures such as annual training for fire and emergency procedures for high-rise building occupants as required by WHMC Section 14.08.010. Site and project characteristics, compliance with state and local building code requirements, and proximity to existing fire stations would minimize the potential wildfire risk and the uncontrolled spread of wildfires. Therefore, impacts to project occupants would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- c. *If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

The project site is already developed and has limited vegetation; therefore, project construction activities that may generate sparks would not exacerbate wildfire risk. In addition, the project site is served by existing utilities and roadway infrastructure and would not require the installation of such infrastructure that would exacerbate wildfire risk. Operation of the proposed new residences and commercial uses would not include activities that would increase the risk of wildfires or require installation of new utilities or infrastructure that would significantly impact the environment. Impacts would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- d. *If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?*

The project site is not located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire severity zone. The project site gently slopes to the south, but is not located immediately adjacent to hillslopes, minimizing the risk of downstream flooding and landslides. According to the Hazard Mitigation Plan, slopes to the north of the city are relatively stable. Furthermore, there have been no recorded landslides in the city (West Hollywood 2018b). Project patrons, employees, and residents would not be exposed to significant risk of downstream flooding or landslides. Impacts would be less than significant and further analysis of this issue is not warranted.

**LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

*This page intentionally left blank.*



# 21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Does the project:

- |  |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <p>a. Have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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. 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>   | ■ | □ | □ | □ |
| <p>c. Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>  | ■ | □ | □ | □ |

a. *Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?*

As discussed in Section 4, *Biological Resources*, because construction of the proposed project would require removal of existing mature trees on the project site, there would be potentially significant impacts to nesting birds that may use the existing trees as habitat. However, implementation of Regulatory Compliance Measure BIO-1 would reduce potential impacts to nesting birds to a less than significant level. As discussed in Section 5, *Cultural Resources*, Section 7, *Geology and Soils*, and Section 18, *Tribal Cultural Resources*, the proposed project could have the potential to impact historical, archaeological, paleontological, and tribal cultural resources. Since the proposed project has potential to degrade the quality of the environment, including potential cultural and historical

resources, this impact is potentially significant and will be further analyzed in an EIR. **POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- 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)?*

As concluded in Sections 1 through 20, the project could result in significant impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. Potential cumulative impacts in these issue areas will be further analyzed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

- c. *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

The potential for the proposed project to directly or indirectly affect human beings will be evaluated in the required EIR particularly with respect to the following issue areas: air quality, GHG emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, and noise. Therefore, since the proposed project could potentially have harmful environmental effects that could affect humans either directly or indirectly, impacts would be potentially significant and these issues will be discussed in an EIR.

**POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

# References

---

## Bibliography

- Advantage Environmental Consultants, LLC. 2023. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. 1000 North La Brea Avenue. West Hollywood, California. May 17, 2023. Document.
- Athens Services. 2022. City of West Hollywood. Accessed October 2023.  
<https://athensservices.com/residential-services/west-hollywood/>.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2005. Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective. Accessed October 2023. <http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/california-air-resources-board-air-quality-and-land-use-handbook-a-community-health-perspective.pdf?sfvrsn=0>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality. Accessed October 2023.  
[https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/2022-sp\\_1.pdf](https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2022-12/2022-sp_1.pdf).
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2021a. California Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation. Accessed November 2023.  
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2021b. California Tsunami Maps. Accessed October 2023.  
<https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2022a. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed October 2023.  
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2022b. California Williamson Act Enrollment Finder. Accessed October 2023.  
<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/WilliamsonAct/>.
- California Department of Finance (California DOF). 2023. Population and Housing Estimates for Cities, Counties, and the State — January 1, 2022 and 2023. Accessed October 2023.  
<https://dof.ca.gov/forecasting/demographics/estimates-e1/>.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2022. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area. Accessed October 2023. <https://calfire-forestry.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=4466cf1d2b9947bea1d4269997e86553>.
- California Department of Transportation. 2018. California State Scenic Highway System Map. Accessed October 2023.  
<https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>.
- California Geological Survey (CGS). 2021. Updated Mineral Resource Zones for Portland Cement Concrete Aggregate in the San Fernando Valley and Saugus-Newhall Production-Consumption Regions. Accessed October 2023.  
[https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Publications/Special-Reports/SR\\_254-MLC-SanFernandoValleySaugusNewhallPCR-2021-Plate01-MRZs-a11y.pdf](https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/Documents/Publications/Special-Reports/SR_254-MLC-SanFernandoValleySaugusNewhallPCR-2021-Plate01-MRZs-a11y.pdf).
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2023. California Rare Plant Ranks. Accessed October 2023.  
<https://www.cnps.org/rare-plants/california-rare-plant-ranks>.

- Campbell, R.H., C.J. Wills, P.J. Irvine, and B.J. Swanson. 2016. Preliminary geologic map of the Los Angeles 30' x 60' quadrangle, California: version 2.1. [map.] California Geological Survey. Preliminary Geological Maps PGM-13-06.2016, scale 1:100,000.
- Citadel EHS. 2022. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. 1020 North La Brea Avenue. West Hollywood, California. February 18, 2022. Document.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2008. Flood Insurance Rate Map No.06037C1605F. Accessed October 2023.  
<https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=1000%20La%20Brea%20Avenue%20West%20Hollywood>.
- Geocon West, Inc. 2023. Geotechnical Investigation. Proposed Mixed-Use High-Rise Development. 1000, 1014, & 1020 North La Brea Avenue. West Hollywood, California. APN: 5531-014-015, 5531-014-016, & 5531-014-017. May 10, 2023. Document.
- Los Angeles County Fire Department (LACFD). 2023. Station Locator. Accessed November 2023.  
<https://locator.lacounty.gov/fire/Search?find=Fire+Stations&near=1000+North+La+Brea+Avenue%2C+West+Hollywood%2C+CA%2C+90038&cat=86&tag=&loc=&lat=34.0891460882114&lon=-118.34365337928513>.
- Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP). 2021. 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. Accessed October 2023. [https://www.ladwp.com/ladwp/faces/ladwp/aboutus/a-water/a-w-sourcesofsupply/a-w-sos-uwmpIn?\\_afLoop=383337918242457&\\_afWindowMode=0&\\_afWindowId=null#%40%3F\\_afWindowId%3Dnull%26\\_afLoop%3D383337918242457%26\\_afWindowMode%3D0%26\\_adf.ctrl-state%3D1dkuz0lz8s\\_4](https://www.ladwp.com/ladwp/faces/ladwp/aboutus/a-water/a-w-sourcesofsupply/a-w-sos-uwmpIn?_afLoop=383337918242457&_afWindowMode=0&_afWindowId=null#%40%3F_afWindowId%3Dnull%26_afLoop%3D383337918242457%26_afWindowMode%3D0%26_adf.ctrl-state%3D1dkuz0lz8s_4).
- Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro). 2023. Metro Maps and Schedules. Accessed November 2023. <https://www.metro.net/riding/schedules-2/>.
- Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). 2023. Open Data Enrollment. Accessed October 2023. <https://my.lausd.net/opendata/dashboard?language=en#>.
- Santa Monica, City of. 2023. GIS Open Data Portal. Airport Noise Contours. Accessed October 2023. <https://gisdata.santamonica.gov/datasets/smgov::airport-noise-contours/explore?location=34.008450%2C-118.384389%2C11.97>.
- Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP). 2010. Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources. Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Impact Mitigation Guidelines Revision Committee. Accessed October 2023. [https://vertpaleo.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/SVP\\_Impact\\_Mitigation\\_Guidelines-1.pdf](https://vertpaleo.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/SVP_Impact_Mitigation_Guidelines-1.pdf).
- Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). 2019. Profile of the City of West Hollywood. Accessed October 2023. [https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/westhollywood\\_localprofile.pdf](https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/westhollywood_localprofile.pdf).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2020. Connect SoCal (2020–2045 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy). Accessed October 2023. <https://scag.ca.gov/read-planadopted-final-connect-social-2020>.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2022. Transit Priority Areas Year (2016). SCAG Region. Accessed November 2023. <https://gisdata-scag.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/transit-priority-areas-year-2016-scag-region/explore>.
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2022. Critical Habitat for Threatened & Endangered Species. Accessed October 2023. <https://fws.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=9d8de5e265ad4fe09893cf75b8dbfb77>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2023. National Wetland Inventory. Wetlands Mapper. Accessed October 2023. <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>.
- West Hollywood, City of. 2010. General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report. Accessed October 2023. <http://www.weho.org/Home/ShowDocument?id=9823>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2011. General Plan 2035 Land Use and Urban Form Element. Accessed October 2023. <https://www.weho.org/home/showpublisheddocument/7939/635229037960770000>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2018a. City of West Hollywood Zoning Districts. Accessed October 2023. <https://www.weho.org/home/showpublisheddocument/36958/636692560718630000>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2018b. Hazard Mitigation Plan. Accessed October 2023. <https://www.weho.org/home/showpublisheddocument/55307/638055871352670000>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2020. General Plan 2035 Safety and Noise Element. Accessed October 2023. <https://www.weho.org/home/showpublisheddocument/56534/638198543045770000>.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2021. WeHo Climate Action. Accessed October 2023. <https://www.weho.org/city-government/city-departments/community-development-department/long-range-planning/climate-action-sustainability>.

## List of Preparers

Rincon Consultants, Inc. prepared this Initial Study under contract to the City of West Hollywood. Staff involved in data gathering analysis, project management, and quality control are listed below.

### **RINCON CONSULTANTS, INC.**

Deanna Hansen, Principal-In-Charge  
 Vanessa Villanueva, Project Manager  
 Jennifer DiCenzo, Senior Paleontologist  
 Rachel Perzel, Senior Architectural Historian  
 Bill Vosti, Senior Environmental Planner  
 Andre McGrath, Senior Paleontologist  
 Lauren Reese, Environmental Planner  
 Katherine Fikan, Environmental Planner  
 James Williams, Architectural Historian  
 Antonia Davetas, Environmental Planner  
 Andrea Ogaz, Architectural Historian  
 Vivian De Anda, Environmental Planner  
 Zachary Lerma, Paleontologist  
 Abigail Robles, GIS Analyst  
 Isabelle Radis, GIS Analyst

*This page intentionally left blank.*