

# 5.0

## ALTERNATIVES TO THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

### 5.1 Introduction

In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, this PEIR contains a comparative impact assessment of alternatives to the proposed Project. The primary purpose for this section is to provide decision makers and the public with a reasonable range of feasible project alternatives that could attain most or all of the basic project objectives, while substantially avoiding or reducing one or more of the project's significant adverse environmental effects. As such, the alternatives discussed within this chapter have been formulated to meet most or all of the proposed Project objectives and, to the extent possible, either avoid or reduce some of the significant effects of the proposed Project (as summarized in Table 5-1).

The discussion under each alternative first compares the difference of effects with regard to the resource areas that were determined to be significantly affected by the proposed Project, followed by a discussion of the difference of effects with regard to resource areas that were determined not to be significantly affected. Agriculture and mineral resources are not present within the Project area and would not be affected by the proposed Project or an analyzed alternative; therefore, these resources are not discussed further in this chapter.

### 5.2 Alternatives Analysis

The CEQA Guidelines state that the discussion of alternatives must focus on alternatives to the project or its location, which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly. Because the proposed Project is a General Plan Update, and must address the City's planning area, no offsite alternative is reasonable or feasible.

This section also identifies the environmentally superior alternative. As required by CEQA, when the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, an environmentally superior alternative must be identified from among the other alternatives. The environmentally superior alternative is discussed near the end of this chapter. Table 5-1 provides a summary comparison of alternatives and the degree of impact within each resource area relative to the impacts associated with the General Plan Update.

The following parameters are set forth by State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 for the analysis of project alternatives:

- an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project;
- alternatives need not be analyzed at the same level of detail as the project itself;
- an EIR should identify alternatives that were considered by the lead agency, but rejected as infeasible;
- reasons for rejecting an alternative include:
  - failure to meet most of the basic project objectives;
  - infeasibility; and/or
  - inability to substantially avoid or reduce any of the project's significant environmental effects.

The discussion provides a qualitative comparison of development under each alternative based upon implementation to the Year 2030. The comparison will focus on the differences between each alternative and the Project based upon development to the 2030 planning horizon. In each case, the 2030 planning horizon assumes what is reasonably foreseeable and does not presume full buildout of each alternative.

## 5.3 Description of the Project

The City proposes a comprehensive update to its General Plan to guide long-range development and redevelopment within the city through 2030. Approval of the General Plan Update (Project) would require the adoption of an updated Land Use Map and eight General Plan Elements: (1) Land Use, (2) Open Space and Recreation, (3) Conservation, (4) Safety, (5) Circulation, (6) Noise, (7) Air Quality, and (8) Housing. Implementation of the Project's proposed goals, objectives, and policies and the updated land use plan would serve to guide the city's future use of land in an effort to encourage compatibility with existing land uses, while identifying the future growth needs of the city.

The Project is expected to provide planning guidance through 2030 and could lead to a potential increase in population by 2,523 residents, growing from 21,256 to 23,799. However, because there is little undeveloped land remaining outside areas designated for parks, recreation, open space, and habitat conservation, residential and commercial growth will be focused in the downtown area and the proposed Mixed Use land use designations, with limited growth through residential infill in the more established residential neighborhoods. Under the proposed Project, residential dwelling units are projected to increase by an additional 814 units to a total of 7,883 units, while commercial space is expected to expand from approximately 845,696 to 2,100,703 square feet, an increase of approximately 1,355,783 square feet, with the large majority being added as mixed-use commercial. An industrial land use designation is not proposed, nor does one currently exist.

## 5.4 Project Objectives

The proposed Project's objectives were developed based on the community planning process described in Chapter 3, "Project Description." Objectives are numbered 1 through 13 for ease of reference within this chapter.

1. retain a quiet, safe, small-town feeling with a semi-rural, predominantly single-family character
2. preserve and increase natural open spaces and parks, and complete the trail system
3. protect the community from safety hazards, such as landslides, wildfires, and seismic events
4. encourage well-maintained neighborhoods and homes, with diverse housing styles in scale with their neighborhoods
5. encourage a vibrant downtown that caters to the residents' needs in a walkable, pedestrian-scale village atmosphere
6. facilitate new housing opportunities for seniors and families near services and transit through mixed-use development
7. provide a circulation system that accommodates vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, hikers, and equestrians; and that reduces the need for people to be dependent on the use of their personal automobiles
8. preserve and protect natural resources, such as wildlife, biological resources, watersheds, and scenic views
9. manage resources, such as water, energy, and air quality, in a responsible and sustainable manner
10. support premier schools

11. maintain an equestrian-friendly community
12. promote an efficiently run government that promotes effective relationships
13. ensure internal consistency between the General Plan's elements.

## 5.5 Overview of Alternatives

The principal criteria for selecting the alternatives studied in this PEIR are to comply with CEQA, to describe a reasonable range of alternatives that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic project objectives and avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects of the project, and to ensure that the impact analysis provides sufficient information to the public and public officials to make informed decisions about the General Plan Update. An EIR conceivably could analyze an infinite number of alternatives or variations on alternatives. However, CEQA directs EIR preparers to analyze a “reasonable range” of alternatives to the project or project location, including the No-Project alternative.

### 5.5.1 Alternatives Selected for Review

The three alternatives are listed below with a summary description following the list:

- Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative) – Existing General Plan
- Alternative 2 – No Mixed Use and Replace with Residential Alternative
- Alternative 3 – No Hillside Residential Land Use Designation Alternative

The following alternative was considered, but not selected. It is discussed in greater detail near the end of this chapter.

- Increased Density in DVSP Area Alternative

## 5.6 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative— Existing No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative considers an option to not accept any updates and retain the existing 1980 General Plan. This alternative consists of the 1980 General Plan with an amended Land Use Element (November 15, 1993), Housing Element (November 15, 1993; draft update prepared 2001), Circulation Element (May 15, 1995), and Air Quality Element (May 15, 1995). The adopted DVSP is included in the No Project Alternative.

The projected level of development under the No Project Alternative is estimated in recent SCAG population studies. The current population is estimated at 21,276 (DOF 2008). By 2015 the population is estimated to grow to 21,628 and by 2030 to 21,862 (SCAG 2008b). This represents a net increase of 586 residents, or 2.7% increase over the 20-year period. The estimated number of dwelling units under the No Project Alternative by 2030 would be approximately 7,209 (SCAG 2008b). The No Project Alternative, in the 2030 horizon year, would result in an estimate of approximately 438 fewer residential units and a potential reduction in commercial space by approximately 682,977 square feet compared to the proposed Project.

As demonstrated by the population estimates, continued growth under the No Project Alternative would be limited. Some redevelopment and spot development of vacant land would occur throughout the city, notably with the most likely scenario being redevelopment of commercial uses in and around the DVSP and the construction of single-family homes in low-density residential neighborhoods. Both commercial redevelopment and residential growth would be concentrated in areas already served with adequate utilities and public services, with the notable exception of sewer/wastewater services.

The revised development estimates allowed under the No Project Alternative in the 2030 horizon year would be approximately 376 additional residential units and a potential increase in commercial space of approximately 572,030 square feet. The qualitative development potential of this alternative will serve as the basis for the analysis of Alternative 1.

## 5.6.1 Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

### Climate Change

Development of the No Project Alternative by 2030 could result in approximately 376 additional residential units and a potential increase of commercial space by approximately 572,030 square feet resulting in additional GHG emissions from construction and operational activities. This would be approximately 438 fewer residential units and 682,977 fewer square feet than the proposed Project. However, unlike many of the other resource areas, climate change has only become a concern in recent years. Consequently, the No Project Alternative does not have policies specific to climate change and GHG emissions.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would allow more residential and commercial development, but this additional development would be in the form of mixed use and would be designed specifically to allow for alternative transportation options such as walking, bicycling, and the increased viability of

public mass transit. Additionally, the General Plan Update contains several policies to help reduce GHG emissions. Finally, the PEIR proposes several mitigation strategies to ensure that future planning addresses GHG emissions and the effect climate change would have on the Project area.

Consequently, even though the No Project Alternative would result in fewer residential units and less commercial square feet, the No Project Alternative does not contain policies or mitigation to reduce GHG emissions, and impacts on and from climate change under the No Project Alternative would be greater than under the General Plan Update.

## **Cultural Resources**

Under the No Project Alternative, redevelopment of existing buildings over 50 years old could occur. Moreover, ground disturbance associated with development activities could lead to significant impacts on subsurface archaeological and/or paleontological resources. However, because the No Project Alternative has a few policies that would protect prehistoric and historical resources, state and federal laws would be the primary source of protection for cultural resources.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would allow additional mixed use development along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards. These areas are already developed, and the No Project Alternative would be able to redevelop in all of the same places, only with different land use types (e.g., commercial in place of mixed use). More importantly, however, the General Plan Update substantially expands on the number of policies designed to protect cultural resources, including a policy that would require archaeological reports, historical building evaluations, and Native American consultation, while mitigation is proposed to provide an action plan to comply with the General Plan Update policies.

Therefore, given the lack of policies protecting cultural resources, impacts on cultural resources under the No Project Alternative would be greater than under the proposed Project.

## **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Under this alternative, development and redevelopment could encounter hazardous materials as a result of ground disturbance during construction activities, particularly development that takes place in the DVSP area and along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards where more commercial uses are located. Moreover, development within the Hillside Residential land use designation

could occur and thus lead to risks from wildfire. Although the No Project Alternative has several policies that address hazards and hazardous materials, impacts from wildfire would likely remain significant and unavoidable.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would reduce the amount of land designated as Hillside Residential and would carry over several of the policies relating to hazards and hazardous materials, while adding a few additional policies. However, the potential impact from fire would exist since the General Plan Update would permit residential development on hillsides with a high potential for wildfire and difficult access for fire-fighting equipment and personnel.

Therefore, because residential development could take place in areas sensitive to wildfire, impacts from hazards and hazardous materials under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those under the proposed Project.

## Hydrology and Water Quality

Under this alternative, development could occur on hillside sites prone to erosion and mudslides. Furthermore, water runoff during construction and operations could carry pollutants to nearby waterbodies. Water runoff, both during and following construction would be regulated under local municipal stormwater regulations in accordance with federal and state law. In addition, the No Project Alternative contains several policies that attempt to reduce the potential impacts associated with hydrology (i.e., flooding, soil erosion, etc.) and water quality.

In comparison, the General Plan Update carries over many of the same policies and includes some new policies designed to minimize hydrology and water quality impacts. However, development would be allowed on hillsides and the same impacts from erosion and mudflow could occur.

Consequently, because development could take place in areas sensitive to erosion and mudflows, impacts on hydrology and water quality from the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed Project.

## Noise

Noise from construction would occur from development allowed under the No Project Alternative, particularly within the DVSP, redevelopment along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards, and within the Estate Residential land use designation. Operational noise would increase under the No Project Alternative for similar reasons, specifically new development within the mixed use areas of the DVSP, which would place noise from commercial uses and traffic in proximity to

residential land uses. However, the No Project Alternative contains policies designed to minimize noise incompatibility through land use and noise guidelines that in some cases would help to reduce noise related to new development.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would add additional residential and commercial – up to 438 residential units and approximately 682,977 square feet of commercial above the No Project Alternative. This new development would result in additional construction and operation noise.

Therefore, because less development would be allowed under the No Project Alternative, and specifically less mixed use would be allowed, the No Project Alternative would have slightly reduced noise impacts compared to the proposed Project.

## Population and Housing

The No Project Alternative is the continuation of the existing 1980 General Plan, which is one resource SCAG uses to estimate future growth in the Project area. Thus, the No Project Alternative would be consistent with the population and housing projections for 2030. As indicated in these estimates (see Chapter 4.11, “Population and Housing”), there would be a slight increase in population and housing units, which would support the determination that the No Project Alternative would have growth-inducing effects. However, the No Project Alternative has policies that seek to ensure a well-planned infrastructure and to generally allow for low density development.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would increase the population and residential units over the number allowed under the No Project Alternative. Introduction of approximately 21.58 acres of mixed use land designations would be proposed, and residential densities would be increased to accommodate a slightly larger population. Moreover, the General Plan Update would carry over several No Project Alternative policies and would add more related to housing and land use. In neither plan would a substantial number of people or housing be displaced from the existing condition, necessitating the construction of housing elsewhere.

Consequently, because the proposed Project would only slightly increase population and housing and would have many policies to ensure adequate services and infrastructure, impacts on population and housing under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those under the proposed Project.

## Transportation, Circulation, and Parking

Development allowed under the No Project Alternative, while less than that permitted under the General Plan Update, could still amount to an additional 376 residential units and 572,030 square feet of commercial. This additional development allowed under the No Project Alternative would increase traffic along two roadways that are at or near failure. Thus, under the No Project Alternative, significant impacts would likely occur at Verdugo Boulevard east of Alta Canyon Road (LOS F) and Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane (LOS E).

In comparison, the General Plan Update would result in more development (up to 438 more residential units and approximately 682,977 more square feet of commercial), but would impact the same roadways, although the greater number of trips under the proposed Project would mean the failing segments would be worse under the General Plan Update. Policies and mitigation would not be available to reduce this impact to less than significant.

Consequently, impacts on Verdugo Boulevard would be reduced under the No Project Alternative and overall impacts on transportation would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project.

## Utilities

Development allowed under the No Project Alternative could result in approximately 376 additional residential units and a potential increase of commercial space by approximately 572,030 square feet. Thus, demand for utilities would increase over the existing condition. Policies in the No Project Alternative ensure adequate utilities are provided to existing and new development.

In comparison, the General Plan Update could result in an additional 438 residential units and up to 682,977 square feet of commercial. The resulting increase in residential and commercial would place slightly greater demand on utilities.

With the lower potential amount of new development, the No Project Alternative would result in slightly less demand on utilities. Therefore, impacts on utilities would be slightly reduced under the No Project Alternative compared to the proposed Project, although impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable.

## 5.6.2 Less than Significant Environmental Impacts (Mitigation Required)

### Air Quality

Development and redevelopment under the No Project Alternative would mainly occur along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards, with the greatest potential within the DVSP area. New development under the No Project Alternative would have to comply with the SCAQMD rules and regulations for reducing air emissions during construction and operation. Moreover, several No Project Alternative policies (from the 1995 Air Quality Element) address air quality and attempt to minimize adverse effects from air emissions.

However, the alternative's land use pattern does not reflect current guidance on limiting the sensitive receptors next to major transportation corridors in order to reduce health risks. Therefore, although development under the No Project would potentially lead to a slightly smaller population, it would allow development that would place sensitive residents in unhealthful locations.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would attempt to limit the number of new sensitive receptors in proximity to freeways. It would also encourage mixed use development through the introduction of a Mixed Use land use designation and a Mixed Use Overlay zone. Development of mixed use would provide greater transportation alternatives and potentially lead to less dependency on automobile use, resulting in less driving for new development. However, the General Plan Update would increase the development potential by up to an additional 438 residential units and 682,977 square feet of commercial, which would ultimately result in a greater amount of construction and operational emissions.

Thus, because the No Project Alternative would allow fewer residential units and less commercial development, impacts on air quality under the No Project Alternative would be reduced in comparison to the proposed Project.

### Biological Resources

Under the No Project Alternative impacts on sensitive habitat could occur from development consistent with the land use policy, particularly within the undeveloped Hillside Residential land use designation area. Furthermore, policies in the No Project Alternative that specifically address biological resources do not provide much protection. However, new development under this alternative would have to comply with federal and state regulations, including regulations enforced by the USFWS and CDFG.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would also allow the same amount of development within the undeveloped areas of the Hillside Residential land use designation. However, the allowed increase in development over the No Project Alternative, which could include up to an additional 438 residential units and 682,977 square feet of commercial, would be located within infill areas that do not support sensitive biological habitat. Moreover, the policies in the General Plan Update designed to protect biological resources are stricter and provide more protection than those in the No Project Alternative.

Therefore, because the policies of the General Plan Update are more extensive and detailed, impacts on biological resources would be slightly greater under the No Project Alternative as compared to the proposed Project.

## **Geology, Seismicity, and Soils**

Under the No Project Alternative, development would be focused along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards, with the greatest potential within the DVSP area. This alternative moderates the exposure of persons and property to geologic, soil, and seismic hazards through policies requiring geologic and soils reports prior to development on hillsides or unstable land. Furthermore, new development under the No Project Alternative would have to comply with the current state building code, notably as it relates to structural stability and seismic engineering.

The General Plan Update would allow additional residential and commercial development along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards. However, such development would be designed in compliance with the current building code. Moreover, the General Plan Update contains similar policies to the No Project Alternative and includes other policies that would help avoid substantial adverse effects, such as ensuring proper implementation of the City's adopted building and development codes to provide safe construction (resistant to earthquake, wind, and other structural loading) and responsible building and site preparation practices to minimize damage from seismic events.

Therefore, because development under both the No Project Alternative and the proposed Project would comply with the current building codes and both contain policies designed to minimize the effects from geologic hazards, potential adverse impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity from the No Project Alternative would be similar to those of the proposed Project.

### 5.6.3 Less than Significant Environmental Impacts (No Mitigation)

#### Aesthetics and Community Character

Under the No Project Alternative, development would be focused within the DVSP and the commercial land use designations along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards, with some residential development within the Estate Residential and Hillside Residential land use designations. Additionally, residential redevelopment may occur sporadically throughout the city. Generally, new development or redevelopment would be in character with the surrounding land uses. Development would have to comply with the No Project Alternative policies and, as applicable, the DVSP and Hillside design guidelines. Thus, the No Project Alternative would not substantially alter the existing aesthetics and community character.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would introduce a Mixed Use land use designation and overlay along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards. Under the General Plan Update, approximately 18.48 acres (and up to an additional 3.1 acres) could be developed with a mixture of commercial and residential land uses. This could modify the community character of the Commercial land use designations of the No Project Alternative that would be redesignated as Mixed Use, but it would generally be consistent with the aesthetics of the commercially-centric areas. Moreover, as with the No Project Alternative, the vast majority of the Project area would be unchanged and little difference in aesthetics and community character would occur.

Thus, because development allowed under either scenario would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and character, impacts on aesthetics and community character under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the proposed Project.

#### Land Use and Planning

The No Project Alternative is the continuation of the existing 1980 General Plan. Thus, at the local level, the No Project Alternative would be consistent with local planning documents and regulations in general. However, the No Project Alternative would not be consistent with many of the regional plans that stress land use planning that reduces automobile dependency and stresses alternative forms of transportation (SCAG 2008b).

In comparison, the General Plan Update would add a mixed use land designation and a mixed use overlay. Combined, these mixed use areas would total approximately 21.58 acres. These areas would be designed to facilitate

alternative modes of transportation, which would help reduce automobile dependency and lead to greater consistency with the regional planning documents.

Consequently, because the No Project Alternative has limited mixed use and does not emphasize reduced dependency on automobile travel through policy, impacts on land use and planning under the No Project Alternative would be slightly greater than under the proposed Project.

## Public Services and Recreation

Development allowed under the No Project Alternative could result in approximately 376 additional residential units and a potential increase of commercial space by approximately 572,030 square feet. Thus, demand for public services and recreation would increase over the existing condition. Policies in the No Project Alternative ensure that adequate services will be provided to existing and new development.

In comparison, the General Plan Update could result in an additional 438 residential units and up to 682,977 square feet of commercial. The resulting increase in residential and commercial uses would place slightly greater demand on public services and recreation.

With the lower potential amount of new development, the No Project Alternative would result in slightly less demand on public services. Therefore, impacts on public services would be slightly reduced under the No Project Alternative as compared to the proposed Project.

### 5.6.4 Conclusion

The No Project Alternative would preserve the existing land use patterns, continue existing policies, and maintain the current development potential for the City. This would result in greater environmental impacts than the General Plan Update in terms of climate change, biological resources, cultural resources, and land use and planning. Impacts from the two plans with respect to hazards and hazardous materials, geology and soils, aesthetics, hydrology and water quality, and population and housing would largely be the same. Impacts from noise and on air quality, public services and recreation, transportation, and utilities would be reduced under the No Project Alternative.

The No Project Alternative does not meet any of the objectives of the General Plan Update because it maintains the existing No Project Alternative and does not update its policies or land use map to account for changing economic conditions, land use patterns, socioeconomic changes, or technological advancements.

## 5.7 **Alternative 2: No Mixed Use and Replace with Residential Alternative**

The No Mixed Use and Replace with Residential Alternative (Alternative 2) would eliminate the Mixed-Use land use designation and Mixed Use Overlay (18.48 and 3.1 acres, respectively; Max 1.3:1 FAR, Max 30 du/ac, Projected 1:1 FAR, 24 du/ac) from the proposed General Plan Update and in its place would designate Medium-High Density Residential (18.48 acres; Max 15 du/ac, Projected 12 du/ac) to allow for a reduced number of multi-family dwelling units along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards. The revised development estimates allowed under Alternative 2 in the 2030 horizon year would be approximately 219 fewer residential units and a potential reduction of commercial space by approximately 940,025 square feet.

Although this alternative would not increase the number of dwelling units with the intent of providing alternative housing options to meet the needs of a growing senior population nor would it facilitate alternative transportation as effectively, it would more closely conform to the existing community character and reduce the total projected residential population, which could reduce environmental impacts typically associated with population growth (e.g. traffic, air quality, noise, etc.). The adopted DVSP, which is part of the existing conditions, would continue under this alternative. The DVSP has approximately 56.59 acres dedicated to the Mixed Use 1 and 2 land use designations; both have a maximum of 15 du/ac and a projected 12 du/ac.

The revised development estimates allowed under Alternative 2 in the 2030 horizon year would be approximately 595 additional residential units and a potential increase in commercial space by approximately 415,758 square feet. The qualitative development potential of this alternative will serve as the basis for the analysis of Alternative 2.

### 5.7.1 **Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts**

#### **Climate Change**

Development under Alternative 2 could result in approximately 595 additional residential units and a potential increase in commercial space by approximately 415,758 square feet, resulting in additional GHG emissions from construction and operational activities. This would be approximately 219 fewer residential units and 940,025 square feet less than the proposed Project.

In comparison, although the General Plan Update would allow more residential and commercial development, the additional development would be in the form of mixed use and would be designed specifically to allow for alternative transportation options such as walking, bicycling, and the increased viability of public mass transit. Additionally, the General Plan Update contains several policies to help reduce GHG emissions. Finally, the PEIR proposes several mitigation strategies to ensure that future planning addresses GHG emissions and the effect climate change would have on the Project area.

Consequently, even though Alternative 2 would result in fewer residential units and less commercial square feet, it does not contain as extensive of a land use policy, which would be designed to increase transportation alternatives. Therefore, impacts on and from climate change under Alternative 2 would be mixed, but similar to, development under the General Plan Update.

## **Cultural Resources**

Under Alternative 2, redevelopment of existing buildings over 50 years old could occur. Moreover, ground disturbance associated with development activities could lead to significant impacts on subsurface archaeological and/or paleontological resources.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would allow additional mixed use development along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards where Alternative 2 would allow medium-high density residential. These areas are already developed and redevelopment could affect buildings over 50 years old or subsurface cultural resources.

Therefore, impacts on cultural resources under Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable.

## **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Although mixed use development outside the DVSP would not be allowed in Alternative 2, development and redevelopment could still occur throughout the area, and ground disturbance could encounter hazardous materials, perhaps most notably within the DVSP or along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards near existing commercial uses. Moreover, development within the Hillside Residential land use designation could occur in Alternative 2 and thus lead to risks from wildfire, which would be a significant impact.

In comparison, development under the General Plan Update could also encounter hazardous materials. Moreover, because the General Plan Update would propose the Hillside Residential land use designation, wildfires would be a threat to property and life as well.

Therefore, impacts from hazards and hazardous materials under Alternative 2 would be similar to those under the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable.

## Hydrology and Water Quality

Although mixed use development outside the DVSP would not be allowed in Alternative 2, development and redevelopment could still occur throughout the Project area, particularly those locations prone to erosion, such as hillside development. Furthermore, water runoff during construction and operations could carry pollutants to nearby waterbodies. Water runoff, both during and following construction, would be regulated under local municipal stormwater regulations in accordance with federal and state law.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would allow the same development in all the same locations except mixed use land uses could be proposed where residential would be in Alternative 2.

Consequently, impacts on hydrology and water quality from Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable.

## Noise

Development allowed under Alternative 2 would be slightly less than that which would be allowed under the General Plan Update; however, although mixed uses would not be permitted outside the DVSP area, medium-high density residential could be built in its place. Noise from construction would increase under Alternative 2 because a relatively high number of dwelling units could be built in a moderately dense area. Moreover, operational noise would likely increase under Alternative 2 because of the proximity to traffic. However, operational noise from mixed uses (commercial and residential) that would place noise from commercial uses and in proximity to residential land uses would not occur outside the DVSP area.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would allow many of the same physical changes to the environment, and, in addition to the mixed use associated with the DVSP, the General Plan Update would propose a new Mixed Use land use designation and a mixed use overlay. The additional mixed use could create

more potential development noise conflicts (i.e., commercial adjacent to or below residential). However, residential noise levels for multi-family uses would be regulated by Title 24 of the CCR, which would require an internal noise level not to exceed 45 dB(A) CNEL.

Therefore, Alternative 2 would have similar noise impacts during construction and operation compared to the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable.

## Population and Housing

Under Alternative 2, new development and redevelopment could result in up to 595 residential units and up to 415,758 commercial square feet over the existing conditions. This would increase the residential population as well. However, development would occur on undeveloped land in the Estate Residential and Hillside Residential areas, within the DVSP area, and along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards. Thus, there would not be a substantial displacement of people or housing.

In comparison, the General Plan Update could increase the population and residential units over the number allowed under Alternative 2 by approximately 219 residential units and 940,025 square feet of commercial. Thus, population and housing would increase under the General Plan Update compared to Alternative 2. However, as with Alternative 2, implementation of the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial displacement of people or housing.

Consequently, because the proposed Project would only slightly increase population and housing and neither scenario would result in a substantial displacement of people or housing, impacts on population and housing under Alternative 2 would be similar to those under the proposed Project.

## Transportation, Circulation, and Parking

Development allowed under Alternative 2, while less than that allowed under the General Plan Update, could still amount to an additional 595 residential units and 415,758 square feet of commercial. This additional development would increase traffic along two roadways that are at or near failure. Thus, under Alternative 2, significant impacts would likely occur at Verdugo Boulevard east of Alta Cañada Road (LOS F) and Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane (LOS E).

In comparison, the General Plan Update would result in more development (up to 219 more residential units and approximately 940,025 more square feet of commercial), but would impact the same roadways, although the greater number

of trips under the proposed Project would mean the failing segments would be worse under the General Plan Update. Policies and mitigation would not be available to reduce this impact to less than significant.

Consequently, impacts on Verdugo Boulevard would be reduced under Alternative 2, and overall impacts on transportation would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project.

## Utilities

Under Alternative 2, development over the existing condition could result in up to 595 additional residential units and a potential increase in commercial space by approximately 415,758 square feet. Consequently, demand for utilities would be slightly increased over the existing condition.

In comparison to Alternative 2, the General Plan Update could result in an additional 219 residential units and up to 940,025 square feet of commercial. The resulting increase in residential and commercial would place slightly greater demand on utilities than Alternative 2.

Therefore, impacts on utilities under Alternative 2 would be slightly reduced as compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable due to water supply.

## 5.7.2 Less than Significant Environmental Impacts (Mitigation Required)

### Air Quality

Under Alternative 2, the additional development of approximately 595 residential units and 415,758 square feet of commercial would create air emissions during construction and operation. New development would have to comply with the SCAQMD rules and regulations for reducing air emissions both during construction and operation.

In comparison, policies in the General Plan Update would encourage mixed use development through the introduction of a Mixed Use land use designation and a mixed use overlay zone. Development of mixed use would provide greater transportation alternatives and potentially lead to less dependency on automobile use, resulting in less driving for new development and therefore fewer emissions from future mobile sources. However, because the General Plan Update would allow up to an additional 219 residential units and 940,025 square feet of commercial, air emissions would be reduced under Alternative 2.

Therefore, impacts on air quality under Alternative 2 would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project.

## Biological Resources

Under Alternative 2, impacts on sensitive habitat could occur from development consistent with the land use policy, particularly within the undeveloped Hillside Residential land use designation area, which includes approximately 340 acres at a development density of 1 du/10 ac. New development under this alternative would have to comply with federal and state regulations, including regulations enforced by the USFWS and CDFG.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would also allow the same amount of development within the undeveloped areas of the Hillside Residential land use designation. Moreover, the allowed increase in development over Alternative 2, which could include up to an additional 219 residential units and 940,025 square feet of commercial, would be located within infill areas that do not support sensitive biological habitat.

Therefore, because both scenarios would allow development within undeveloped areas (namely the Hillside Residential designation), impacts on biological resources under Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

## Geology, Seismicity, and Soils

Under Alternative 2, approximately 595 additional residential units and 415,758 square feet of additional commercial space would be allowed. Medium-high density residential development would be focused along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards, with additional redevelopment potential within the DVSP area. New development under Alternative 2 would have to comply with the current state building code, notably as it relates to structural stability and seismic engineering, which would serve to substantially reduce geologic hazards.

In comparison, in addition to the development allowed under Alternative 2, the General Plan Update would permit up to an additional 219 residential units and 940,025 square feet of commercial. Much of this development would be in the form of mixed use residential and commercial located along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards. However, as with development under Alternative 2, such development would be designed in compliance with the current building code.

Therefore, because development under both Alternative 2 and the proposed Project would comply with the current building codes, potential adverse impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity from Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

### **5.7.3 Less than Significant Environmental Impacts (No Mitigation)**

#### **Aesthetics and Community Character**

The difference between the potential physical changes of Alternative 2 and the General Plan Update is the Mixed Use land use designation being replaced by medium-high density residential. Alternative 2 would modify the existing character of the commercial land use designations to medium-high density residential land uses, which would also contribute to a slight change in community character by removing low-density commercial and adding moderate density residential. In most cases, the revitalization of the older commercial areas with new residential would improve the Project-area aesthetics. Furthermore, the vast majority of development within the Project area, including the DVSP area, would be consistent with the aesthetics and community character of the city.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would introduce a Mixed Use land use designation and overlay along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards. Under the General Plan Update, approximately 18.48 acres (and up to an additional 3.1 acres) could be developed with a mixture of commercial and residential land uses. This could modify the community character of the commercial land use designations of the 1980 General Plan by developing mixed use commercial-residential, but this redevelopment would generally be consistent with the aesthetics of the commercially centric areas and, because it would replace older commercial, would likely improve the area aesthetics. Moreover, as with the No Project Alternative, the vast majority of the Project area would be unchanged and little difference in aesthetics and community character would occur.

Thus, because development allowed under either scenario would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and character, impacts on aesthetics and community character under Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain less than significant.

## Land Use and Planning

Alternative 2 proposes a land use map that would redesignate commercial land uses with medium-high density residential. However, Alternative 2 would not mix commercial land uses with residential, possibly limiting the local jobs-housing balance and resulting in a land mix that would be slightly less conducive to certain alternative transportation modes (e.g., walking and bicycling). Regional planning documents encourage land use patterns that facilitate reduced automobile use and increase of forms of transportation.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would add a Mixed Use land designation and a mixed use overlay. Combined, these mixed use areas would total approximately 21.58 acres. These areas would be designed to facilitate alternative modes of transportation, which would help reduce automobile dependency and lead to greater consistency with the regional planning documents.

Consequently, because Alternative 2 only proposes additional residential and not mixed use (outside of the DVSP), impacts on land use and planning under Alternative 2 would be slightly greater than under the proposed Project.

## Public Services and Recreation

Under Alternative 2, development over the existing conditions could result in up to 595 additional residential units and a potential increase in commercial space by approximately 415,758 square feet. Consequently, demand for public services and recreation would be slightly increased over the existing condition.

In comparison to Alternative 2, the General Plan Update could result in an additional 219 residential units and up to 940,025 square feet of commercial. The resulting increase in residential and commercial would place slightly greater demand on public services and recreation than Alternative 2.

Therefore, impacts on public services under Alternative 2 would be slightly reduced as compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts would likely remain less than significant.

### 5.7.4 Conclusion

Alternative 2 would propose the same elements of the General Plan with the notable exception of not designating for mixed use outside of the DVSP. Instead of the 18.48 acres being designated as Mixed Use it would designate them as Medium-High Residential. The result would be 219 fewer residential units and 940,025 square feet of less mixed use commercial area.

The resulting lower overall population and the lack of mixed land uses would help reduce impacts related to transportation, public services and recreation, and utilities. However, by not allowing mixed land uses, Alternative 2 could result in greater impacts related to land use and planning. Impacts under Alternative 2 on air quality, climate change, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, aesthetics and community character, and population and housing would be similar to the proposed Project.

Alternative 2 meets many, but not all of the Project objectives. It does not meet objective #6 and only partially meets objectives #5 and #7 of the General Plan Update because it does not provide mixed use along Foothill Boulevard, which is the area identified as possible senior housing (#6), does not encourage a walkable downtown village to as great an extent as the proposed Project because it would not include allow development of mixed use uses on 21.58 acres along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards (#5), and similarly does not reduce the need for automobiles as substantially as the proposed Project (#7).

## 5.8 **Alternative 3: No Hillside Residential Land Use Designation Alternative**

The No Hillside Residential Land Use Designation Alternative (Alternative 3) would eliminate the potential for new development within the proposed Hillside Residential land use designation and would seek to preserve the hillside land as open space for habitat preservation and to prevent potential harm to life and property from wildfires and mudslides. To accomplish this alternative without resulting in an unconstitutional regulatory “taking,” an organization or government would need to purchase this land from private property owners. Consequently, the ultimate feasibility of this alternative is not certain at this time. However, implementation of this alternative would reduce environmental impacts associated with wildfire and mudflow.

Residential development under this alternative would decrease by between 17 and 34 residential units in comparison to the General Plan Update to approximately 797, although commercial square footage would remain at the same estimate of approximately 1,355,783 over the existing condition. The qualitative development potential of this alternative will serve as the basis for the analysis of the No Hillside Residential Land Use Designation Alternative.

## 5.8.1 Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

### Climate Change

As discussed above, development under Alternative 3 could result in approximately 797 additional residential units and a potential increase of commercial space by approximately 1,355,783 square feet, resulting in additional GHG emissions from construction and operational activities. This would be approximately 17 fewer residential units than the proposed Project, but the same amount of allowed commercial space.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would allow development of approximately 17 residential dwelling units in the Hillside Residential land use designation. This could expose homes and people to the affects of climate change, such as increased wildfire and mudflow. Thus, the proposed Project would be considered to have a greater effect related to climate change.

Consequently, Alternative 3 would result in fewer residential units and no additional development in the hillside areas, and thus would result in reduced impacts related to climate change when compared with the proposed Project.

### Cultural Resources

Under the Alternative 3, redevelopment of existing buildings over 50 years old could occur. Moreover, ground disturbance associated with development activities could lead to significant impacts on subsurface archaeological and/or paleontological resources.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would also allow development within the Hillside Residential land use designation, which does not pose a risk of affecting historic buildings, but may result in disturbance of archaeological or paleontological resources.

Therefore, impacts on cultural resources under Alternative 3 would be reduced under Alternative 3 when compared to the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable.

## Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Although development within the Hillside Residential land use designation would not occur under Alternative 3, development and redevelopment could still occur throughout the area, and ground disturbance could encounter hazardous materials, perhaps most notably within the DVSP or along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards near existing commercial uses.

In comparison, development under the General Plan Update could also encounter hazardous materials. Moreover, because the General Plan Update would propose the Hillside Residential land use designation, wildfires would be a threat to property and life as well.

Therefore, impacts from hazards and hazardous materials under Alternative 3 would be reduced when compared with the proposed Project. Impacts could be reduced from significant and unavoidable to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

## Hydrology and Water Quality

With the exception of the Hillside Residential land use designation, development under Alternative 3 could occur throughout the Project area. This may lead to water runoff during construction and operations, which could carry pollutants to nearby waterbodies. Water runoff, both during and following construction, would be regulated under local municipal stormwater regulations in accordance with federal and state law. However, because this alternative would not permit development within the Hillside Residential land use designation, erosion and runoff associated with hillside development would be eliminated. Furthermore, impacts from mudflow would be reduced, although not likely to a level less than significant due to the fact that homes could still be built (on a lot-by-lot basis) near hillsides that could lead to potential damage from mudflow.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would allow the same development in all the same locations except it would also allow hillside development. Thus, the proposed Project would be subject to erosion and water runoff from hillside development as well as increase the risk of damage to property from mudflow.

Consequently, impacts on hydrology and water quality from Alternative 3 would be reduced when compared with the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable because homes could still be built near hillsides on a case-by-case basis.

## Noise

Development allowed under Alternative 3 would be slightly less than the General Plan Update. Noise from construction would increase under Alternative 3 because of the focus of development in the DVSP and Mixed Use land use designation along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards. Moreover, operational noise would likely increase under Alternative 3 because of the proximity to traffic at these locations.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would allow the same development, but would also allow approximately 17 residential dwelling units in the Hillside Residential land use designation. These units would be remote and distant from existing residential and commercial uses. Thus, the addition of these uses would not result in a notable increase in construction and operational noise.

Therefore, Alternative 3 would have similar noise impacts during construction and operation when compared with the proposed Project; however, impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable.

## Population and Housing

Under Alternative 3, new development and redevelopment could result in up to 797 residential units and up to 1,355,783 commercial square feet over the existing condition. This would increase the residential population. However, development would occur on undeveloped land in the Estate Residential and DVSP areas and along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards. Thus, there would not be a substantial displacement of people or housing.

In comparison, the General Plan Update could increase the population and residential units over the number allowed under Alternative 3 by approximately 17 residential units. Thus, population and housing would slightly increase under the General Plan Update as compared to Alternative 3. However, as with Alternative 3, implementation of the General Plan Update would not result in a substantial displacement of people or housing.

Consequently, because the proposed Project would only slightly increase population and housing and neither scenario would result in a substantial displacement of people or housing, impacts on population and housing under Alternative 3 would be similar to those under the proposed Project.

## Transportation, Circulation, and Parking

Development allowed under Alternative 3 could amount to an additional 797 residential units and 1,355,783 square feet of commercial. This additional development would increase traffic along two roadways that are at or near failure. Thus, under Alternative 3, significant impacts would likely occur at Verdugo Boulevard east of Alta Canyon Road (LOS F) and Verdugo Boulevard between Park Place and Lanterman Lane (LOS E).

In comparison, the General Plan Update would result in slightly more development (approximately 17 more residential units), but would impact the same roadways, although the slightly greater number of trips under the proposed Project would mean the failing segments would be worse under the General Plan Update. However, the difference would be nearly imperceptible. Policies and mitigation would not be available to reduce this impact to less than significant.

Consequently, impacts on Verdugo Boulevard would be similar under Alternative 3 and overall impacts on transportation would be similar to the proposed Project.

## Utilities

In this alternative, development over the existing condition could result in up to 797 additional residential units and a potential increase in commercial space by approximately 1,355,783 square feet. Consequently, demand for utilities would be slightly increased over the existing condition.

In comparison to Alternative 3, the General Plan Update could result in an additional 17 residential units within the Hillside Residential land use designation. The resulting increase in residential use would place slightly greater demand on utilities than would be the case if Alternative 3 was implemented.

Therefore, impacts on public services under Alternative 3 would be reduced when compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts would likely remain significant and unavoidable due to water supply.

## 5.8.2 Less than Significant Environmental Impacts (Mitigation Required)

### Air Quality

Under Alternative 3, the additional development of approximately 797 residential units and 1,355,783 square feet of commercial would create air emissions during construction and operation. New development would have to comply with the SCAQMD rules and regulations for reducing air emissions both during construction and operation.

In comparison, policies in the General Plan Update would allow for nearly the same amount of new development, except development of the Hillside Residential land use designation would not be allowed. Thus, the proposed Project would develop 17 more residential units than Alternative 3. Therefore, although air emissions could be slightly less under Alternative 3, the difference is so small as to be considered inconsequential at the general plan level.

Consequently, impacts on air quality under Alternative 3 would be similar to the proposed Project.

### Biological Resources

Under Alternative 3, development would not be permitted within the natural habitats of the Hillside Residential land use designation, which would reduce the potential impacts on sensitive biological resources. In other areas that may contain sensitive vegetation, new development would have to comply with federal and state regulations, including those enforced by the USFWS and CDFG.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would allow development within the undeveloped areas of the Hillside Residential land use designation. This difference between the plans is substantial in terms of potential impacts on biological resources.

Therefore, because Alternative 3 would not permit development within the Hillside Residential land use designation, impacts on biological resources would be reduced when compared with the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

## **Geology, Seismicity, and Soils**

Under Alternative 3, approximately 797 additional residential units and 1,355,783 square feet of additional commercial space would be allowed. Mixed Use development would be focused along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards, with additional redevelopment potential within the DVSP area. New development under Alternative 3 would have to comply with the current state building code, notably as it relates to structural stability and seismic engineering, which would serve to substantially reduce geologic hazards.

In comparison, in addition to the development allowed under Alternative 3, the General Plan Update would permit approximately 17 residential units within the Hillside Residential land use designation. These dwelling units would be at a very low density of 1 dwelling unit to 10 acres. However, as with Alternative 3, new development would comply with the most recent seismic building code requirements.

Therefore, because development under both Alternative 3 and the proposed Project would comply with the current building codes, potential adverse impacts on geology, soils, and seismicity from Alternative 3 would be similar to those of the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

### **5.8.3 Less than Significant Environmental Impacts (No Mitigation)**

#### **Aesthetics and Community Character**

Alternative 3 would modify the existing character of the commercial land use designations by allowing mixed use commercial-residential, which would contribute to a slight change in the community character by removing low-density commercial and adding moderate density commercial-residential. In most cases, the revitalization of the older commercial areas with new commercial-residential would improve the Project area's aesthetics. Furthermore, the vast majority of development within the Project area, including the DVSP area, would be consistent with the aesthetics and community character of the city.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would introduce the same Mixed Use land use designation and overlay along Foothill and Verdugo Boulevards. Under the General Plan Update, however, approximately 17 units are projected to be built in the Hillside Residential land use designation. This is in line with the existing development in the area and the proposed Project would carry forward the 1980 General Plan land use policy in this location. Thus, the proposed Project's land use policy would generally be consistent with the existing aesthetic and community character.

Therefore, because development allowed under either scenario would be compatible with the surrounding land uses and character, impacts on aesthetics and community character under Alternative 3 would be similar to the proposed Project. Impacts would likely remain less than significant.

## Land Use and Planning

Alternative 3 proposes a land use map that would redesignate commercial land uses with mixed use and a mixed use overlay. Combined, these mixed use areas would total approximately 21.58 acres. These areas would be designed to facilitate alternative modes of transportation, which would help reduce automobile dependency and lead to greater consistency with the regional planning documents.

In comparison, the General Plan Update would add the same mixed use land designation and a mixed use overlay. However, the General Plan Update would allow development within the Hillside Residential land use designation. This extremely low density development, while not specifically inconsistent with regional plans, also would not achieve regional development goals that focus on smart growth and high density, mixed use development.

Consequently, because both Alternative 3 and the General Plan Update would implement Mixed Use land designations, impacts on land use and planning under Alternative 3 would be similar to the proposed Project.

## Public Services and Recreation

In this alternative, development over the existing condition could result in up to 797 additional residential units and a potential increase in commercial space by approximately 1,355,783 square feet. Consequently, demand for public services and recreation would be slightly increased over the existing condition.

In comparison to Alternative 3, the General Plan Update could result in an additional 17 residential units within the Hillside Residential land use designation. The resulting increase in residential within a difficult-to-access area would place slightly greater demand on public services and recreation than would be the case if Alternative 3 was implemented, particularly in regards to a coordinated wildfire response.

Therefore, impacts on public services and recreation under Alternative 3 would be reduced as compared to the proposed Project; however, impacts would likely remain less than significant.

## 5.8.4 Conclusion

The No Hillside Residential Land Use Designation Alternative would propose many of the same elements of the General Plan Update and could contain many of the same of policies or modify others, as applicable. The slightly lower overall population and the lack of development in the Hillside Residential land use designation would likely result in reduced impacts on hazards and hazardous materials and hydrology and water quality from significant and unavoidable to less than significant with mitigation incorporated and would also reduce the impacts on climate change, cultural resources, air quality, biological resources, public services and recreation, and utilities. Impacts under the No Hillside Residential Land Use Designation Alternative related to noise, transportation, air quality, geology and soils, aesthetics, land use and planning, and population and housing would be similar to the proposed Project. No impacts under this alternative would be greater than under the proposed Project.

The No Hillside Residential Land Use Designation Alternative meets all objectives and would potentially reduce two significant and unavoidable impacts, but would be difficult to implement because the City does not own the land within the Hillside Residential land use designation and would be subject to private property rights and laws. While potentially feasible, specific legal reasons make adoption of this alternative a challenge to implement.

## 5.9 Alternatives Considered and Not Selected

### 5.9.1 Increased Density in the DVSP Area Alternative

The Increased Density in the DVSP Area Alternative would increase the maximum allowed residential dwelling units in the Downtown Village Specific Plan area to maximize alternative transportation options (e.g., walking, bicycling, and public transit) and therefore facilitate a decreased dependency on automobile transportation. The DVSP area contains approximately 27.27 acres of vacant or underutilized land with a maximum of up to 15 du/ac and a realistic 12 du/ac. Under this alternative, dwelling units per acre would increase to a maximum of 30 du/ac and a realistic 24 du/ac. This would increase the permitted dwelling units from a reasonably foreseeable 327 units to approximately 654 units. Although this alternative would increase the number of dwelling units with the intent of providing alternative housing options to meet the needs of a growing senior population and would attempt to utilize alternative transportation more effectively, it would also increase the total potential population, which could increase environmental impacts generally associated with population growth in comparison to the Project.

The Increased Density in the DVSP Area Alternative would propose many of the same elements of the General Plan Update and could contain many of the same policies or modify others, as applicable. The slightly greater overall population and the greater density within the DVSP would not reduce any impacts identified under the General Plan Update, but by increasing the residential density within a mixed use area and an area already served by commercial uses, the Increased Density in the DVSP Area Alternative would encourage walking, bicycling, use of mass transit, and other forms of alternative transportation. Consequently, the Increased Density in the DVSP Area Alternative would likely result in greater impacts on air quality, transportation, climate change, public services, recreation, and utilities. Impacts which would be similar to the General Plan Update would include hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology, noise, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, aesthetics and community character, land use and planning, and population and housing.

Although the Increased Density in the DVSP Area Alternative would meet all objectives, as noted in the previous paragraph, it would not reduce any significant and unavoidable impacts, and, in several cases, would likely result in greater environmental impacts. Therefore, this alternative was considered but was not selected for a full comparison.

## 5.10 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The qualitative environmental effects of each alternative in relation to the General Plan Update are summarized in Table 5-1. The No Hillside Residential Land Use Designation Alternative (Alternative 3) would be the environmentally superior based on the reductions to impacts associated with the proposed General Plan Update.

**Table 5-1.** Summary Impact Comparison of General Plan Update Alternatives

<b>Environmental Resource</b>	<b>General Plan Update (Proposed Project)</b>	<b>No Project (Alternative 1)</b>	<b>No Mixed Use and Replace with Residential (Alternative 2)</b>	<b>No Hillside Residential (Alternative 3)</b>
Climate Change	Significant	Greater	Similar	Reduced
Cultural Resources	Significant	Greater	Similar	Reduced
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Significant	Similar	Similar	Reduced
Hydrology and Water Quality	Significant	Similar	Similar	Reduced
Noise	Significant	Reduced	Similar	Similar
Population and Housing	Significant (Cumulative)	Similar	Similar	Similar
Transportation, Circulation, and Parking	Significant	Reduced	Reduced	Similar
Utilities	Significant	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced
Air Quality	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Reduced	Reduced	Similar
Biological Resources	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Greater	Similar	Reduced
Geology, Soils, and Seismicity	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Similar	Similar	Similar
Aesthetics and Community Character	Less than Significant	Similar	Similar	Similar
Land Use and Planning	Less than Significant	Greater	Greater	Similar
Public Services and Recreation	Less than Significant	Reduced	Reduced	Reduced