5.0 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, including in many cases an alternative location for the project that could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives but avoid or substantially lessen any of the project's significant environmental effects, and an evaluation of the comparative merits of each of the alternatives. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6.) This chapter sets forth the potential alternatives to the proposed project and compares the potential impacts of each alternative with the proposed project's impacts.

Key provisions in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 regarding alternatives are summarized below to explain the foundation of the alternatives analysis.

- The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location that 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 be more costly.
- The No Project Alternative shall be evaluated along with its impact. The No Project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.
- The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by the "rule of reason," which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.
- Factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability; economic viability; availability of infrastructure; General Plan consistency; other plans or regulatory limitations; jurisdictional boundaries; and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site(s).
- Only alternative locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.
- An EIR need not consider an alternative under which the effect cannot be reasonably ascertained and implementation is remote and speculative.

In identifying alternatives for this EIR, alternatives were selected by the City of West Hollywood (City) that comply with CEQA requirements and would otherwise be reasonable and feasible for the project site, in consideration of the characteristics of the area and public comments received during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) comment periods (July 2004, July 2007 and February 2012) and at the public scoping meetings on April 7, 2004, and July 25, 2007.

5.2 SELECTION OF ALTERNATIVES

Section 21100 of the Public Resources Code (PRC) and Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines require an EIR to identify and discuss a No Project Alternative as well as a reasonable range of alternatives to a project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts. Alternatives to the proposed project considered for analysis in this EIR are:

- **Alternative 1: No Project/No New Development.** This Alternative would involve no changes to the existing land uses and conditions on the project site. No new development on the project site would occur.
- **Alternative 2: Reduced Project/Reduced Office Uses**. This Alternative would include the same proposed uses as the proposed project but would reduce the office uses from 137,064 square feet to approximately 102,000 square feet. The office uses on the fifth level of the Boulevard building (Building B1) and the fourth level of the Gateway Building (Building A) would most likely be eliminated under this Alternative.
- **Alternative 3: Reduced Project/Historic Resource Avoidance.** This Alternative would include the retail, office and residential uses proposed on the project site under the proposed project. However, these uses would be reduced and redesigned in order to retain the existing historic resource structure at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard. This Alternative would preclude the construction of the Gateway Building (Building A), and (most likely) a small portion of the Avenue Buildings (Building B2).

Table 5.A provides a summary of the relative impacts and feasibility of each alternative. A complete discussion of each alternative is provided below.

For each alternative, the analysis provides the following:

- Description of the alternative;
- Overview of the potential impacts of the alternative and the significance of those impacts (per the CEQA Guidelines, significant effects of an alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than those of the proposed project); and
- Summary comparison of the alternative relative to the proposed project's impacts, specifically addressing whether the alternative would meet the project objectives, eliminate or reduce impacts as compared to the project, and other comparative merits.

5.2.1 Alternatives Considered but Rejected

Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines suggests that EIRs identify any alternatives that were considered by the Lead Agency but were rejected during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons underlying the Lead Agency's determination. In evaluating an appropriate range of alternatives to the proposed project, a number of alternatives were considered and rejected for differing reasons by the City.

Table 5.A: Summary of Development Alternatives

Alternative	Description	Basis for Selection and Summary Analysis
Proposed Project	• 82,021 square feet of retail/restaurant uses • 137,064 square feet of office uses • 77,753 square feet of residential uses (76 units) • Demolishes historic structure at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard	• Refer to Chapters 3.0 and 4.0 of this Recirculated Draft EIR • Meets project objectives • Results in significant unavoidable impacts related to historic resources and traffic
Alternative 1: No Project/No New Development	• Existing uses on site consist of commercial, office, and light industrial buildings; paved parking lots; and a parking structure • Does not demolish historic structure at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard	• Required by CEQA • Does not meet project objectives • Would eliminate significant impacts to historic resources and traffic
Alternative 2: Reduced Project/Reduced Office Uses	• 82,021 square feet of retail/restaurant uses • Approximately 102,000 square feet of office uses • 77,753 square feet of residential uses (76 units) • Demolishes historic structure at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard	• Meets some of the project objectives • May reduce, but not eliminate, significant impacts related to traffic • Results in significant unavoidable impact related to historic resources
Alternative 3: Reduced Project/ Historic Resource Avoidance	• Approximately 60,400 square feet of retail/restaurant uses • Approximately 86,500 square feet of office uses • 77,753 square feet of residential uses (76 units) • Does not demolish historic structure at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard	• Meets some of the project objectives • May reduce, but not eliminate, significant impacts related to traffic • Would avoid the significant impact related to historic resources

CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
EIR = Environmental Impact Report

The alternatives considered and rejected for the proposed project are listed below.

Alternative Location. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2)(A) states: "The key question [with regard to alternative locations] and first step in analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR." Further, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(1) states that alternative locations only need be considered if the project proponent can reasonably acquire or already owns the identified alternative site. The proposed project is location-specific, as the project is to redevelop the project site that is currently owned by the Applicant. Because the City is already built-out, obtaining another similar-sized site is not considered feasible. There is no other site within the City that would accommodate the size of the proposed development; therefore, the Draft EIR does not include analysis regarding alternative locations.

Design Alternatives. During preparation of the Recirculated Draft EIR, the City suggested consideration of a project alternative that would include a different mix of land uses, such as a Boutique Hotel concept. In order to determine the feasibility of such a design alternative, two scenarios were evaluated for their ability to reduce or eliminate the significant traffic impacts associated with the proposed project. The two land use mix alternatives are described below.

Alternative Land Use Mix – Boutique Hotel/No Residential Uses. Under this Alternative, a 60-room Boutique Hotel use would replace the residential component of the proposed project in the Avenue Buildings (Building B2). The amount of retail/restaurant and office uses would remain the same as under the proposed project. This Alternative assumes that the existing buildings on the project site, including the historic building at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard, would be removed from the site. Table 5.B summarizes the uses assumed on the project site under this Alternative.

Table 5.B: Alternative Land Use – Boutique Hotel/No Residential Uses

	Proposed Uses (square footage)					
Level	Retail/ Restaurant	Office	Residential	Boutique Hotel	Shared[1]	Total
Melrose Level/B1	23,766	1,178		1,102[2]	4,271	30,317
Santa Monica/First Floor	58,255	2,761		1,895[2]	1,835	64,746
Second Floor		38,994		30,218		69,212
Third Floor		38,164		28,850		67,014
Fourth Floor		36,913		9,112		46,025
Fifth Floor		19,054		6,576		25,630
Total	**82,021**	**137,064**		**77,753**	**6,106**	**302,944**

Source: Studio One Eleven. Melrose Triangle Project Summary, September 9, 2013.
[1] Shared area comprises common access space and mechanical areas.
[2] Comprises lobby, stairwells, and elevator areas for hotel uses.

In order to determine whether this Alternative would reduce the significant and adverse traffic impacts associated with the proposed project, trip generation comparisons were completed. A 60-room Boutique Hotel is projected to result in approximately 535 Average Daily Traffic (ADT), with 40 AM peak-hour trips, 42 midday peak-hour trips, and 38 PM peak-hour trips. The results of the trip generation for this Alternative indicated that the replacement of the residential uses with the Boutique Hotel uses would not reduce the overall numbers, and would result in a total of 30 additional ADT trips. The only time period for this Alternative that would result in fewer trips than the proposed project was during the PM peak hour, which would have 9 fewer PM peak-hour trips. However, this difference of 9 trips for one time segment is not enough to significantly reduce or eliminate the proposed project's adverse impacts at study area intersections. Therefore, this Alternative was rejected from further consideration.

Alternative Land Use Mix – Boutique Hotel/Reduced Office Uses. Under this Alternative, a 60-room Boutique Hotel use would replace approximately 34,000 square feet of the office uses as

included in the proposed project. The amount of retail/restaurant and residential uses would remain the same as under the proposed project. This Alternative assumes that the existing buildings on the project site, including the historic building at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard, would be removed from the site. Table 5.C summarizes the uses assumed on the project site under this Alternative.

Table 5.C: Alternative Land Use – Boutique Hotel/Reduced Office Uses

	Proposed Uses (square footage)					
Level	Retail/ Restaurant	Office	Boutique Hotel	Residential	Shared[1]	Total
Melrose Level/B1	23,766	1,178		775[2]	4,271	29,990
Santa Monica/First Floor	58,255	2,761		1,450[2]	1,835	64,301
Second Floor		38,994		31,209		70,203
Third Floor		38,164		29,043		67,207
Fourth Floor		21,903	15,010	8,795		45,708
Fifth Floor		--	19,054	6,481		25,535
Total	**82,021**	**103,000**	**34,064**	**77,753**	**6,106**	**302,944**

Source: Studio One Eleven. Melrose Triangle Project Summary, September 9, 2013.
[1] Shared area comprises common access space and mechanical areas.
[2] Comprises lobby, stairwells, and elevator areas for residential uses.

In order to determine whether this Alternative would reduce the significant and adverse traffic impacts associated with the proposed project, trip generation comparisons were completed. As stated above, the 60-room Boutique Hotel would result in approximately 535 ADT, with 40 AM peak-hour trips, 42 midday peak-hour trips, and 38 PM peak-hour trips. The results of the trip generation indicated that the reduction of office uses with the addition of a 60-room Boutique Hotel uses would result in 9 fewer AM peak-hour trips and 8 fewer midday peak-hour trips than the proposed project. The PM peak hour trips would be the same as under the proposed project. However, although peak hour trips varied slightly, this Alternative would increase the total ADT by approximately 200 trips. Therefore, because the total ADT would increase with this Alternative as compared to the proposed project, and because it would not significantly reduce or eliminate the project's adverse impacts at study area intersections, this Alternative was rejected from further consideration.

5.3 PROPOSED PROJECT

As described earlier in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, the proposed project would demolish all the existing buildings and structures on the project site and construct a mixed-use retail/restaurant, office, and residential development. As shown earlier in Figure 3.3 (Conceptual Site Plan), the development would consist of three primary structures, referred to as Buildings A (the Gateway Building), B1 (the Boulevard Building), and B2 (the Avenue Buildings). Building A would be a single structure on the southwest corner of the project site. Buildings B1 and B2 would be a series of buildings around a central landscaped courtyard. Portions of all three buildings would surround a broad paseo running through the center of the project site that would allow pedestrian access between Santa Monica Boulevard and Melrose Avenue. Table 5.D summarizes the square footage of the land uses on the project site under the proposed project. Chapter 3.0 provides additional descriptive information regarding the proposed project and figures showing the site layout and elevations.

Table 5.D: Project Square Footage

Level	Proposed Uses (square footage)				Total
	Retail/ Restaurant	Office	Residential	Shared[1]	
Melrose Level/B1	23,766	1,178	775[2]	4,271	**29,990**
Santa Monica/First Floor	58,255	2,761	1,450[2]	1,835	**64,301**
Second Floor		38,994	31,209		**70,203**
Third Floor		38,164	29,043		**67,207**
Fourth Floor		36,913	8,795		**45,708**
Fifth Floor		19,054	6,481		**25,535**
Total	**82,021**	**137,064**	**77,753**	**6,106**	**302,944**

Source: Studio One Eleven. Melrose Triangle Project Summary, September 9, 2013.
[1] Shared area comprises common access space and mechanical areas.
[2] Comprises lobby, stairwells, and elevator areas for residential uses.

5.3.1 Project Objectives

Each alternative is analyzed to determine whether it achieves the basic objectives of the proposed project. The underlying purpose of the proposed project would provide a mixed-use commercial and residential development project of superior quality and design using sustainable and environmentally superior practices within the Melrose Triangle portion of the City. The proposed project would recognize and pay homage to the importance of pedestrians in the City by creating a project of three detached buildings around a central landscaped courtyard to simultaneously encourage pedestrian activity at the project site while also allowing pedestrian access between Santa Monica Boulevard and Melrose Avenue. The proposed mixed-use development would include residential, retail/restaurant, and office uses, thus maximizing shopping, eating, and working efficiencies for local residents and reducing vehicle trips. In addition, the proposed project would accommodate the need for additional residential housing in the City and in the County of Los Angeles while supporting and promoting the economic vitality of the City. The project objectives listed in Chapter 3.0 are repeated below and numbered for reference in this chapter.

1. Develop the Melrose Triangle with a mix of high-density residential, commercial-retail, and office uses compatible with adjacent development and consistent with community needs.
2. Provide a modern, high-quality design that complements surrounding uses and contributes to a sense of community, yet stands as an architectural gateway to the City.
3. Provide additional housing opportunities and contribute to the residential development of mixed-use areas by incorporating residential uses into an existing core of nearby community facilities, employment centers, retail goods and services, and restaurants to enhance the area's overall urban character.
4. Increase the City's rental housing stock for low- and moderate-income renters.
5. Create a consistent pattern of development and uses along Santa Monica Boulevard that serves project residents and the surrounding community by redeveloping an underutilized site.
6. Provide jobs that use the existing labor pool living in and around the City.

7. Minimize the impact to the environment through the redevelopment of previously developed parcels.
8. Enhance the intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard, Melrose Avenue, and Doheny Drive so that it may serve as a recognizable entrance to the City through:
   - the location, form, and architectural elements of structures;
   - landscaped open spaces; and
   - public art and/or other appropriate design techniques.
9. Develop and encourage pedestrian-oriented uses, making the area more pedestrian friendly.
10. Provide seating for the existing transit stop at the corner of Melrose Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard.
11. Expand the economic base of the City, maintain economic vitality, and foster the City's fiscal health by, among other things, providing for commercial and retail activities with the potential to generate substantial sales and property tax revenue.
12. Ensure appropriate and necessary infrastructure capacity for the project.
13. Implement a comprehensive landscaping program that complies with the City's Code.
14. Provide adequate common open space and internal access within the project site to meet the needs of the proposed uses and users.
15. Provide improvements that encourage alternative and fuel-efficient forms of transportation (e.g., bicycle storage areas, preferential parking for low-emission/fuel-efficient vehicles and carpools/vanpools, etc.).
16. Provide pedestrian and bicycle access to the project.
17. Promote sustainability, including measures to increase efficiency and the use of renewable resources while decreasing use of non-renewable energy.
18. Implement green building design and construction practices capable of achieving Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED™) certification for the buildings within the project.
19. Promote the efficient use of water and energy through incorporation of water and energy conservation measures.

5.3.2 Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project

As discussed in detail in Chapter 4.0, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, the proposed project would result in significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts related to historic resources and traffic.

As described in detail in Section 4.4, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, the proposed project would result in a significant adverse impact to historic resources due to the removal of the building at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard. The impact due to the loss of this historic resource would remain significant and adverse even after implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT-1 and CULT-2 provided in Section 4.4, Cultural and Paleontological Resources. No additional mitigation is possible to mitigate the adverse impact of the project on this resource to below a level of significance. Therefore, the proposed project impact to this historic resource would remain significant and adverse

after mitigation. In addition, this significant unavoidable adverse project impact would contribute to a cumulative adverse impact related to the loss of historic resources in the City.

As described in Section 4.14, Transportation and Circulation, the proposed project would create a significant traffic/circulation impact at two study area intersections in the existing plus project scenario, Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue and Foothill Road/Santa Monica Boulevard. In the cumulative year 2016 plus project scenario, the project would significantly impact both of these intersections as well as two others, Doheny Drive/Santa Monica Boulevard and Doheny Drive/ Beverly Boulevard. For one or more of the following reasons, mitigation is not feasible for these intersections: the addition of lanes would not relieve the forecast delays; acquisition of property outside of the current roadway right-of-way would be undesirable/infeasible; there would be an impact according to City of Beverly Hills criteria but not according to the City of West Hollywood criteria; or the City has no jurisdiction to make the improvements or to ensure their implementation. Therefore, impacts to these four intersections would remain significant and adverse.

The alternatives to the proposed project considered in this analysis were developed to avoid or minimize these significant unavoidable adverse impacts of the proposed project.

As described in Chapter 4.0, the proposed project would not result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, global climate change, biological resources, archaeological and paleontological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use, population and housing, recreation, public services and utilities, hydrology/water quality, geology and soils, and noise. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that all mitigation measures required for project implementation would apply to the project alternatives and similar reductions in impacts would be achieved. Therefore, the project impacts and the potential impacts of the project alternatives related to these issues are not discussed in detail in this section. The following discussion of project alternatives focuses on potential impacts to historic resources and traffic.

5.4 ALTERNATIVE 1: NO PROJECT/NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

5.4.1 Description

Consistent with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, the No Project/No Development Alternative assumes the existing land uses and condition of the project site at the time the NOP was published would continue to exist without changes. The setting of the site at the time the NOP was published is described as part of the existing conditions throughout Chapter 3.0 of this EIR with respect to individual environmental issues and forms the baseline of the impact assessment of the proposed project. This Alternative represents the environmental conditions that would exist if no new development of any kind were to occur on the project site. The No Project/No Development Alternative anticipates that the existing office, retail (e.g., art galleries, a furniture showroom), service commercial (e.g., hair salons, clothing alterations), light industrial (e.g., upholstery), and parking uses on the site would continue to operate without any improvements or changes.

The existing City of West Hollywood General Plan land use designation for the project site is Commercial Community 2 (CC2). The base land use designation of CC2 allows for commercial uses with a floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.0 and a building height of 44 feet (four stories). In addition to the base land use, the General Plan allows height and density bonuses of an additional 10 feet in height

and 35 percent residential for affordable housing, a 0.1 FAR bonus for green building, and an additional 15 feet in height and 0.5 FAR bonus for projects located in the Gateway Mixed-Use Area. The project site is also located in one of the City's Gateway Mixed-Use Areas. The Gateway Mixed-Use Area allows Residential Mixed-Use projects in the CC2 designation located on parcels bounded by Santa Monica Boulevard, Almont Drive, and Melrose Avenue that provide exemplary architectural design elements; maintain at least 20 percent of the total site area as open space, of which 40 percent must be maintained as pedestrian open space or pedestrian walkthroughs open to the sky; and provide for a double row of street trees along Santa Monica Boulevard.

The existing zoning designation for the project site is Community Commercial (CC). The CC zoning district is intended to provide a wide variety of commercial opportunities to serve local community needs as well as broader market areas. The CC zoning district identifies areas appropriate for a variety of commercial uses, including the following: retail; professional offices; business support and personal services; entertainment uses; restaurants; specialty shops; overnight accommodations; cultural uses; and small-scale manufacturing uses related to design furnishings, galleries, motion pictures, television, music, or design-related uses. Mixed-use developments with residential and office uses above commercial, retail, and service businesses are encouraged in the City's General Plan and Zoning Code. The CC zoning district is consistent with the CC2 General Plan land use designation for the project site.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would continue existing land uses on the existing project site. There would be no expansion or addition of allowable uses on the site. The No Project/ No Development Alternative would allow existing conditions to remain unchanged.

5.4.2 Environmental Analysis

The No Project/No Development Alternative assumes that the existing conditions on site would remain unchanged. The site is developed with two office buildings along Santa Monica Boulevard that are two and three stories high. There is also a one-story building on the corner of Santa Monica Boulevard and Almont Drive. The building that faces Santa Monica Boulevard between the large office building and the corner building has its address and entry on Almont Drive. Three single-story buildings (an upholstery shop, furniture showroom, and antique shop) are located along Almont Drive, although the building adjacent to the parking structure is hidden from view from the street. Two buildings are sited along Melrose Avenue: (1) a single-story building housing primarily art galleries; and (2) a three-story office building. Parking uses include various small storefront parking lots, two surface parking lots in the western and central parts of the site, rooftop parking above the art gallery building, and a three-level parking structure on the east part of the project site.

The project site is bounded by existing public streets on all sides: Santa Monica Boulevard to the north, Almont Drive to the east, Melrose Avenue to the south, and Doheny Drive to the west. Land uses in the immediate project vicinity are primarily commercial uses. To the north, uses include a variety of commercial uses. To the east along Almont Drive, uses are primarily furniture and design showrooms. South of the project site on Melrose Avenue are retail/service and office uses. To the southwest, across the large multiple intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard/Melrose Avenue/Doheny Drive, is a hotel. To the northwest is Beverly Gardens Park, a small neighborhood open space in the City of Beverly Hills. Farther from the project site are multi-family and single-family residential uses on Rangely Avenue, which are separated from the project site by the commercial uses on the south

side of Melrose Avenue. There is multi-family housing southwest of the hotel at the intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard/Melrose Avenue/Doheny Drive. North and west of Beverly Gardens Park is a large neighborhood of single-family residences, with two multi-family residential buildings facing Doheny Drive.

This Alternative assumes that the existing structures would not be demolished and that the land uses would continue to operate in their current condition into the future. While maintenance would occur, it is assumed that renovations and new construction would not occur; however, vacant spaces could be leased. Construction impacts associated with the project would be avoided because no development would occur on the project site under the No Project/No Development Alternative.

Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the visual setting of the project site would continue to be the aging, unconsolidated individual structures that lack visual continuity. The project site would not be redeveloped as a gateway to the City, and the visual improvements associated with the proposed project would not occur under this Alternative. No impacts related to biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, or land use would occur under this alternative since no physical site changes would occur. Operational impacts associated with air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, hydrology/water quality, noise, public services, utilities, and recreation would be avoided because no changes to the project site would occur. Impacts related to population and housing would be greater under this Alternative because no residential uses would be developed, and no additional affordable housing would be made available in the City.

Without demolition and construction of the project's uses, the existing historic building at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard would not be removed. Under the No Project/No Development Alternative, the historic structure would not be demolished, destroyed, relocated, or altered in such a way as to compromise its eligibility for listing on the California Register, and no significant impact related to historic resources would occur.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not add traffic trips to the existing street system; therefore, this Alternative would not contribute to project-level or cumulative traffic impacts.

5.4.3 Overview of Potential Impact/Comparison to Proposed Project

The No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid impacts related to historic resources because the building at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard would not be removed.

Similarly, the No Project/No Development Alternative would avoid significant impacts related to project-level and cumulative traffic because no new development or associated trips would occur.

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not result in any significant unavoidable adverse impacts, whereas the proposed project would result in significant unavoidable adverse impacts related to historic resources and traffic.

5.4.4 Project Objectives

The No Project/No Development Alternative would not achieve any of the Project Objectives. Without the proposed project, the project site would not be redeveloped with a mix of retail/ restaurant, office, and residential uses. The No Project/No Development Alternative would not help the City accommodate housing demands, including demand for affordable housing, nor would it expand the economic base of the City, or foster the City's fiscal health. This Alternative would not foster pedestrian-oriented uses or enhance the area's overall urban character. In addition, improvements for the project vicinity would not occur, such as seating for the existing transit stop at the corner of Melrose Avenue and Santa Monica Boulevard and architectural improvements at this intersection that would have allowed it to serve as a recognizable entrance to the City.

5.5 ALTERNATIVE 2: REDUCED PROJECT/REDUCED OFFICE USES

5.5.1 Description

This Alternative assumes the site is developed with the same retail/restaurant and residential uses as the proposed project, but with a reduced amount of office uses. Approximately 35,000 square feet of office uses would be eliminated, reducing the overall office uses from 137,064 square feet to approximately 102,000 square feet. The office uses on the fifth level of the Boulevard Building (Building B1) and the fourth level of The Gateway Building (Building A) would most likely be eliminated under this Alternative. Table 5.E summarizes the uses assumed on the project site under this Alternative. This Alternative would result in the removal of all the existing uses on the project site.

Table 5.E: Alternative 2: Reduced Project/Reduced Office Uses (square footage)

Level	Proposed Uses (square footage)				Total
	Retail/ Restaurant	Office	Residential	Shared[1]	
Melrose Level/B1	23,766	1,368	775[2]	4,271	30,180
Santa Monica/First Floor	58,255	2,718	1,450[2]	1,835	64,258
Second Floor		39,011	31,209		70,220
Third Floor		37,911	29,043		66,954
Fourth Floor		21,080	8,795		29,875
Fifth Floor			6,481		6,481
Total	**82,021**	**102,088**	**77,753**	**6,106**	**267,968**

Source: Studio One Eleven. Melrose Triangle Project Summary, September 9, 2013.
[1] Shared area comprises common access space and mechanical areas.
[2] Comprises lobby, stairwells, and elevator areas for residential uses.

5.5.2 Environmental Analysis

Aesthetics. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to aesthetics, light, and glare. Although one level of the Boulevard and Gateway Buildings would most likely be eliminated under this Alternative, the design of Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed project and would not conflict with the visual character of the site or the surrounding area. This Alternative would, like the proposed project, be required to comply with the City's lighting

code. Overall, the building massing on site would be similar to the proposed project but lower in height; therefore, aesthetic impacts associated with Alternative 2 are considered to be less than the proposed project.

Air Quality. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to air quality. Construction and operational emissions associated with Alternative 2 would be reduced since the amount of office uses would be reduced and fewer vehicle trips would be generated due to the reduced size of the Alternative. Overall, air quality impacts would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the project due to the reduced amount of building construction. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would not exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants with implementation of mitigation and standard South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) measures. Operational impacts would be slightly reduced with the reduced amount of office square footage. Overall, there would be fewer air quality emissions; therefore, Alternative 2 would be slightly superior to the proposed project.

Biological Resources. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to biological resources. Alternative 2, like the proposed project, would remove all existing structures and vegetation on the project site. This Alternative would implement a landscape plan similar to the proposed project. Therefore, biological impacts associated with Alternative 2 are considered to be similar to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources.

Archaeological and Paleontological Resources. Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would not significantly impact cultural resources. No archaeological or paleontological resources are known to exist at the project site. However, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would be required to adhere to mitigation to protect any unknown archaeological or paleontological resources. Therefore, this Alternative's impacts to such resources would be similar to the proposed project.

Historic Resources. The Reduced Project/Reduced Office Uses Alternative would require demolition of existing uses on the project site, including the historic structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard. The impact due to the loss of this historic resource would remain significant and adverse even after implementation of Mitigation Measures CULT-1 and CULT-2 provided in Section 4.4, Cultural and Paleontological Resources. No additional mitigation is possible to mitigate the adverse impact of the alternative on this resource to below a level of significance. Therefore, the impact to this historic resource would remain significant and adverse after mitigation. In addition, this significant unavoidable adverse project impact would contribute to a cumulative adverse impact related to the loss of historic resources in the City. Therefore, this Alternative would not eliminate or reduce this significant unavoidable impact of the proposed project to a less than significant level.

Geology and Soils. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils with implementation of mitigation and adherence to the recommendations of the geology study to mitigate potential geological hazards. Construction and excavation activities associated with implementation of this Alternative would be similar to those associated with the proposed project; therefore, impacts to geology and soils would be comparable. Geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative 2 are, therefore, considered to be similar to the proposed project.

Global Climate Change. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and global climate change. Overall, GHG emissions would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the project due to the reduced amount of building construction. Operational emissions would also be reduced with the reduced amount of office square footage and fewer vehicle trips. Overall, there would be incrementally fewer GHG emissions; therefore, Alternative 2 would be superior to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. Although there would be reduced construction required for this Alternative, Alternative 2 would be required to implement mitigation measures and comply with regulations for handling hazardous materials during construction activities. Neither the proposed project nor Alternative 2 would result in significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials during project operations. Overall, impacts related to hazardous materials are considered the same for Alternative 2 as for the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Similar to the proposed project, construction of Alternative 2 could potentially impact water quality related to erosion and pollutants. However, compliance with regulatory requirements and mitigation would ensure these impacts would be less than significant. Water quality impacts associated with construction would be similar to the proposed project since all structures on site would be demolished and excavation would still occur. Although Alternative 2 would have a reduced amount of office uses and would result in fewer building levels, there would be a similar amount of impervious surfaces as the proposed project. With compliance with regulatory requirements, operational impacts would be less than significant for this Alternative, similar to the proposed project. Overall, impacts related to hydrology for Alternative 2 would be similar to the proposed project.

Land Use. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to land use and planning. This Alternative would contain both commercial and residential uses, consistent with the existing land use pattern in the area. Overall, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would be consistent with the General Plan policies, providing a mixed-use development that would be enhance the Santa Monica Boulevard Corridor, introduce socially valued uses, provide additional housing, provide diverse retail services, enhance pedestrian activity, provide local-serving commercial services and uses, and provide outdoor cafes. Therefore, impacts related to land use for Alternative 2 are considered similar to the proposed project.

Noise. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have less than significant impacts related to noise. Construction activity associated with Alternative 2 would be less due to construction of lower building levels, but would generally result in similar noise and vibration levels since the construction and excavation areas, methods, and equipment would be similar. With implementation of mitigation, both the proposed project and Alternative 2 would reduce potentially significant construction impacts to a less than significant level. Alternative 2 would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project due to the reduction in office uses and would, therefore, result in lower mobile noise levels. However, similar to the proposed project, implementation of mitigation measures would reduce adverse traffic noise impacts both off site and on the proposed residential uses on the project site to below a level of significance. Because there would be less office uses constructed with this alternative, overall impacts related to noise for Alternative 2 are considered less than for the proposed project.

Population and Housing. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact on population and housing. Although Alternative 2 would provide the same amount of residential uses units and retail/restaurant units, the reduction in the amount of office uses compared to the proposed project would result in fewer of employment opportunities. Overall, impacts related to population and housing under Alternative 2 are considered slightly more than similar the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact on public services and utilities. Because the amount of office uses would be reduced under Alternative 2, the demands for public services and utilities would be slightly reduced as compared to the proposed project. Overall, impacts related to public services and utilities under Alternative 2 are considered less than under the proposed project.

Recreation. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 2 would have a less than significant impact on recreational facilities. Alternative 2 would increase demand on parks and recreation facilities within the City of West Hollywood. Although the same number of residential units would be constructed under Alternative 2, the increased demand would be slightly less as compared to the proposed project due to the reduced amount of office uses. Overall, impacts related to recreational facilities under Alternative 2 are considered slightly less than under the proposed project.

Traffic. Alternative 2 would generate fewer trips than the proposed project due to the reduction in office uses on the site. Under the proposed project, significant and adverse impacts would occur at two study area intersections in the existing plus project scenario (Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue, and Foothill Road/Santa Monica Boulevard). In the cumulative year 2016 plus project scenario, the proposed project would significantly impact both of these intersections as well as Doheny Drive/ Santa Monica Boulevard and Doheny Drive/Beverly Boulevard.

Trip generation prepared for Alternative 2 indicates that this Alternative would result in approximately 346 fewer total ADT trips as compared to the proposed project. Alternative 2 also would result in 51 fewer AM peak-hour and midday peak-hour trips, and 39 fewer PM peak-hour trips than the proposed project. Table 5.F provides the Level of Service (LOS) summary for Existing Conditions plus Alternative 2 and for Cumulative Year 2016 plus Alternative 2. The results indicate

Table 5.F: Alternative 2 Intersection Level of Service Summary

	Intersections	City	Type	Existing Plus Alternative						Cumulative Year 2016 Plus Alternative					
				AM		Midday		PM		AM		Midday		PM	
				V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
16	Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue	WH	U	NA		NA		>180	F	NA		NA		>180	F
17	Doheny Drive/Santa Monica Blvd.	WH	C	NA		NA		NA		NA		139.0	F	134.6	F
		BH/ CMP	S	NA		NA		NA		NA		1.103	F	NA	
18	Doheny Drive/Beverly Blvd.	WH	C	NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
		BH	S	NA		NA		NA		NA		0.931	E	NA	
22	Foothill Road/Santa Monica Blvd.	BH	U	NA		95.0	F	NA		>180	F	>180	F	>180	F

BH = Beverly Hills
C = Commercial Corridor
CMP = Congestion Management Program
LOS = level of service
NA = No Proposed Project Impact
S = Signalized
U = One- or Two-Way Stop-Controlled
V/C = volume-to-capacity ratio
WH = West Hollywood

that the reduction of office uses under this Alternative would not reduce or eliminate the significant traffic impacts at the above-described four intersections. While Alternative 2 would only significantly impact the intersection of Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue in the existing plus project scenario, this alternative is expected to have a significant and adverse cumulative impact at the intersections of Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue, Foothill Road/Santa Monica Boulevard, Doheny Drive/Santa Monica Boulevard, and Doheny Drive/Beverly Boulevard.

5.5.3 Overview of Potential Impacts/Comparison to Proposed Project

Impacts related to historic resources in the City would remain significant and adverse under this Alternative because it would include demolition of the historic structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard. Therefore, Alternative 2, the Reduced Project/Reduced Office Uses Alternative, would not eliminate or reduce impacts to historic resources as compared to the proposed project. In addition, this Alternative would not eliminate the adverse cumulative impact related to the loss of historic resources in the City.

As shown in Table 5.E, this Alternative would not reduce significant and adverse cumulative traffic impacts at the intersections of Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue, Foothill Road/Santa Monica

Boulevard, Doheny Drive/Santa Monica Boulevard, and Doheny Drive/Beverly Boulevard. Therefore, Alternative 2 would reduce the impact on one intersection, but would not eliminate traffic impacts as compared to the proposed project.

5.5.4 Attainment of Project Objectives

The Reduced Project/Reduced Office Uses Alternative would achieve many of the project objectives but would not utilize the parcels to their full extent. The proposed project would not exceed the allowable density or heights for the project site. Therefore, the reduction in office square footage under Alternative 2 would not maximize the redevelopment potential of the site. Consequently, Alternative 2 would not expand the economic base of the City or foster the City's fiscal health to the same degree as the proposed project. This Alternative would meet many of the project objectives, but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

5.6 ALTERNATIVE 3: REDUCED PROJECT/HISTORIC RESOURCE AVOIDANCE

5.6.1 Description

This Alternative would include the retail, office and residential uses proposed on the project site under the proposed project. However, these uses would be reduced and redesigned in order to retain the existing Streamline Modern Building located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard. This Alternative would preclude the construction of Building A (the Gateway Building), and (most likely) a small portion of Building B2. Table 5.G summarizes the projected uses to be included on the project site under this Alternative. It should be noted that final design plans developed to avoid the historic resource could result in changes to the overall square footage for this Alternative; estimates for Alternative 3 are made for comparison purposes with the proposed project, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6.

Table 5.G: Reduced Project/Historic Resource Avoidance Alternative

	Proposed Uses (square footage)				
Level	Retail/ Restaurant	Office	Residential	Shared[1]	Total
Melrose Level/B1	21,450	1,368	775[2]	3,868	27,461
Santa Monica/First Floor	38,950	2,718	1,450[2]	2,238	45,356
Second Floor		22,180	31,209		53,389
Third Floor		21,080	29,043		50,123
Fourth Floor		21,080	8,795		29,875
Fifth Floor		18,145	6,481		24,626
Total	**60,400**	**86,571**	**77,753**	**6,106**	**230,830**

Source: Studio One Eleven. Melrose Triangle Project Summary, September 9, 2013.

1 Shared area comprises common access space and mechanical areas.

2 Comprises lobby, stairwells, and elevator areas for residential uses.

5.6.2 Environmental Analysis

Aesthetics. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to aesthetics, light, and glare. Because the historic structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard would not be removed under this Alternative, and because this Alternative would preclude construction of the Gateway Building and a portion of the Avenue Buildings, the design and site plan for Alternative 3 would be impacted and would not result in a cohesive site design. Although Alternative 3 would not create a unified gateway design for the project site, the overall massing would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. This Alternative would not conflict with the visual character of the site or surrounding area. Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would be required to comply with the City's lighting code. Although the building massing is reduced, this Alternative would not result in a cohesive redevelopment and design of the project site. Therefore, the level of aesthetic impacts associated with Alternative 3 is considered to be generally similar to the proposed project.

Air Quality. Construction and operational emissions associated with Alternative 3 would be reduced since the structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard would not be removed under this Alternative. Overall, air quality impacts would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the project due to the reduced amount of building construction. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not exceed significance thresholds for criteria pollutants with implementation of mitigation and standard SCAQMD measures. Operational impacts would be slightly reduced with the reduced amount of new building square footage. Overall, there would be fewer air quality emissions; therefore, Alternative 3 would be slightly superior to the proposed project.

Biological Resources. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to biological resources. Although the historic structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard would not be removed under this Alternative, Alternative 3 would remove all of the other existing structures and vegetation on the project site. This Alternative would implement a landscape plan similar to, but less extensive than the proposed project. Therefore, biological impacts associated with Alternative 3 are considered to be similar to the proposed project.

Cultural Resources.

Archaeological and Paleontological Resources. Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would not significantly impact cultural resources. No archaeological or paleontological resources are known to exist at the project site. However, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would be required to adhere to mitigation to protect any unknown archaeological or paleontological resources. Therefore, this Alternative's impacts to such resources would be similar to the proposed project.

Historic Resources. Alternative 3, the Reduced Project/Historic Resource Avoidance Alternative, would avoid demolition of the historic structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard. In order to avoid removal of the historic Streamline Modern Building, the Gateway

Building (Building A) proposed as part of the proposed project would not be constructed. This Alternative would not result in a significant project impact or a significant cumulative impact related to the loss of historic resources in the City. This Alternative would reduce this significant unavoidable impact of the proposed project to a less than significant level. Therefore, this Alternative is considered to have fewer impacts to historic resources as compared to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to geology and soils with implementation of mitigation and adherence to the recommendations of the geology study to mitigate potential geological hazards. Because the historic structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard would not be removed under this Alternative, construction and excavation activities associated with implementation of this Alternative would be less than those associated with the proposed project. Because less excavation would occur, impacts to geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative 3 are considered to be fewer than under the proposed project.

Global Climate Change. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to GHG emissions and global climate change. Overall, GHG emissions would be incrementally reduced during construction when compared to the project due to the reduced amount of building demolition and construction. Operational emissions would also be reduced with the reduced amount of square footage and fewer vehicle trips. Overall, there would be incrementally fewer GHG emissions; therefore, Alternative 3 would be superior to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials. Although there would be reduced demolition and construction required for this Alternative, Alternative 3 would be required to implement mitigation measures and comply with regulations for handling hazardous materials during construction activities. Neither the proposed project nor Alternative 3 would result in significant adverse impacts related to hazardous materials during project operations. Overall, impacts related to hazardous materials are considered the same for Alternative 3 as for the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality. Similar to the proposed project, construction of Alternative 3 could potentially impact water quality related to erosion and pollutants. However, compliance with regulatory requirements and mitigation would ensure that these impacts would be less than significant. Water quality impacts associated with construction would be fewer than for the proposed project since the structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard would not be removed under this Alternative, and less excavation would occur than under the proposed project. Although Alternative 3 would have a reduced amount of square footage and would result in fewer buildings, there would be a similar amount of impervious surfaces as the proposed project. With compliance with regulatory requirements, operational impacts would be less than significant for this Alternative, similar to the proposed project. Overall, impacts related to hydrology for Alternative 3 would be fewer than the proposed project due to the reduced amount of demolition and construction.

Land Use. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to land use and planning. This Alternative would contain both commercial and residential uses, consistent with the existing land use pattern in the area. Overall, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would be consistent with the General Plan policies: provide a mixed-use development, introduce socially valued uses, provide additional housing, provide diverse retail services, provide local-serving commercial services and uses, and provide outdoor cafes. However, pedestrian connectivity through the site would not be accomplished since this Alternative would not include removal of the structure at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard. In addition, Alternative 3 would not enhance the Santa Monica Boulevard Corridor to the same degree as the proposed project since there would not be a cohesive site design for the entire project site. Therefore, impacts related to land use would be slightly greater for Alternative 3 as compared to the proposed project.

Noise. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have less than significant impacts related to noise. Construction activity associated with Alternative 3 would be less due to removal of fewer structures on the site and a reduced amount of excavation. With implementation of mitigation, both the proposed project and Alternative 3 would reduce potentially significant construction impacts to a less than significant level. Alternative 3 would result in fewer daily vehicle trips than the proposed project due to the reduction in the amount of site uses and would, therefore, result in lower mobile noise levels. However, similar to the proposed project, implementation of mitigation measures would reduce adverse traffic noise impacts both off site and on the proposed residential uses of the project site to below a level of significance. Because there would be fewer square feet constructed with this Alternative, overall impacts related to noise for Alternative 3 are considered less than under the proposed project.

Population and Housing. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have a less than significant impact on population and housing. Although the amount of retail/restaurant and office uses would be reduced under this Alternative, 76 residential units would still be provided under Alternative 3. Alternative 3 would generate fewer employment opportunities, based on the total of square feet of retail/restaurant uses and office uses for this Alternative as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, because fewer jobs would be generated, impacts related to population and housing under Alternative 3 are considered greater than the proposed project.

Public Services and Utilities. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have a less than significant impact on public services and utilities. Because the overall amount of uses would be reduced under Alternative 3, the demands for public services and utilities would be reduced as compared to the proposed project. Overall, impacts related to public services and utilities under Alternative 3 are considered less than under the proposed project.

Recreation. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would have a less than significant impact on recreational facilities. Alternative 3 would increase demand on parks and recreation facilities within the City of West Hollywood. Although the same number of residential units would be constructed under Alternative 3, the increased demand would be slightly less as compared to the

proposed project due to the reduced amount of other uses. Overall, impacts related to recreational facilities under Alternative 3 are considered slightly less than under the proposed project.

Traffic. Alternative 3 would generate fewer trips than the proposed project due to the reduction in uses on the project site, primarily the elimination of the Gateway Building (Building A) under the proposed project. For the proposed project, significant and adverse impacts would occur at two study area intersections in the existing plus project scenario (Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue and Foothill Road/Santa Monica Boulevard). In the cumulative year 2016 plus project scenario, the proposed project would significantly impact both of these intersections as well as Doheny Drive/Santa Monica Boulevard and Doheny Drive/Beverly Boulevard.

Trip generation prepared for Alternative 3 indicates that this Alternative would result in approximately 1,465 fewer ADT trips as compared to the proposed project. Alternative 3 also results in 103 fewer AM peak-hour trips, 223 fewer midday peak-hour trips, and 115 fewer PM peak-hour trips than the proposed project. Table 5.H provides the LOS summary for Existing Conditions plus Alternative 3 and for Cumulative Year 2016 plus Alternative 3. The results indicate that the reduction of uses on site, primarily the elimination of the Gateway Building (Building A) under this Alternative would reduce the significant traffic impacts at two intersections. In the existing plus project scenario, Alternative 3 would result in a significant adverse impact at the intersection of Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue but would not result in a significant adverse impact at the intersection of Foothill Road/Santa Monica Boulevard. Alternative 3 would result in significant adverse cumulative impacts at both the intersection of Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue and Foothill Road/Santa Monica Boulevard. However, adverse cumulative impacts at the intersections of Doheny Drive/Santa Monica Boulevard and Doheny Drive/Beverly Boulevard, which would occur with the proposed project, would be avoided by Alternative 3.

Table 5.H: Alternative 3 Intersection Level of Service Summary

				Existing Plus Alternative						Cumulative Year 2016 Plus Alternative					
				AM		Midday		PM		AM		Midday		PM	
	Intersections	City	Type	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS	V/C or Delay	LOS
16	Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue	WH	U	NA		NA		174.0	F	NA		NA		>180	F
17	Doheny Drive/Santa Monica Blvd.	WH	C	NA		NA		NA		NA		133.9	F	132.4	F
		BH/CMP	S	NA		NA		NA		NA		1.091	F	NA	
18	Doheny Drive/Beverly Blvd.	WH	C	NA		NA		NA		NA		NA		NA	
		BH	S	NA		NA		NA		NA		0.921	E	NA	
22	Foothill Road/Santa Monica Blvd.	BH	U	NA		90.7	F	NA		>180	F	>180	F	>180	F

BH = Beverly Hills
C = Commercial Corridor
CMP = Congestion Management Program
LOS = level of service
NA = No Proposed Project Impact
S = Signalized
U = One- or Two-Way Stop -Controlled
V/C = volume-to-capacity ratio
WH = West Hollywood

5.6.3 Overview of Potential Impacts/Comparison to Proposed Project

Alternative 3, the Reduced Project/Historic Resource Avoidance Alternative, would avoid significant project and cumulative impacts related to the loss of historic resources in the City because it would not include demolition of the historic structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard.

As shown in Table 5.F, for the existing plus Alternative 3 scenario, impacts at the Foothill Road/ Santa Monica Boulevard intersection would be eliminated as compared to the proposed project. In addition, adverse cumulative impacts at the intersections of Doheny Drive/Santa Monica Boulevard and Doheny Drive/Beverly Boulevard would be avoided by Alternative 3. Therefore, Alternative 3 would reduce traffic impacts at several intersections as compared to the proposed project.

5.6.4 Attainment of Project Objectives

The Reduced Project/Historic Resource Avoidance Alternative would achieve many of the project objectives but would not utilize the parcels to their full extent. Although Alternative 3 would avoid the historic resource located on the project site, the reduction of retail and office uses would not maximize the redevelopment potential of the project site or fully enhance the area's overall urban character. Consequently, Alternative 3 would not expand the economic base of the City or foster the City's fiscal health to the same degree as the proposed project. In addition, this Alternative would not enhance the intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard/Melrose Avenue/Doheny Drive. This Alternative would meet the some of the project objectives, but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

5.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) states that if the No Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, then the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Table 5.I provides, in summary format, a comparison of the level of impacts for each alternative to the proposed project.

The No Project/No Build Alternative has the least impact to the environment because it would not require demolition of the historic structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard, and it would avoid a significant traffic impact in the existing plus project scenario at two intersections (Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue, and Foothill Road/Santa Monica Boulevard), and avoid a significant cumulative traffic impact at four intersections (Doheny Drive/Elevado Avenue, Foothill Road/Santa Monica Boulevard, Doheny Drive/Santa Monica Boulevard and Doheny Drive/Beverly Boulevard). While the No Project Alternative would lessen or avoid the significant impacts of the proposed project, the beneficial impacts of the proposed project—including the provision of new housing opportunities and development of a mixed-use area—would not occur, and none of the project objectives would be met.

Table 5.I: Comparison of the Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project to the Project Alternatives

Environmental Topic	Proposed Project Level of Impacts After Mitigation	Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative	Alternative 2: Reduced Project/Reduced Office Uses	Alternative 3: Reduced Project/ Historic Resource Avoidance
Aesthetics	Less Than Significant	G	L	S
Air Quality	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Biological Resources	Less Than Significant	L	S	S
Cultural Resources				
Archaeological/Paleontological	Less Than Significant	L	S	S
Historical Resources	**Significant and unavoidable**	L	S	L
Geology and Soils	Less Than Significant	L	S	L
Global Climate Change	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Less Than Significant	L	S	S
Hydrology and Water Quality	Less Than Significant	L	S	L
Land Use	Less Than Significant	L	S	G
Noise	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Population and Housing	Less Than Significant	G	S	G
Public Services and Utilities	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Recreation	Less Than Significant	L	L	L
Traffic	**Significant and unavoidable**	L	L	L
Attainment of project objectives	Meets all of the project objectives	Meets none of the project objectives	Meets a majority of the project objectives but not to the same degree as the proposed project	Meets a majority of the project objectives but not to the same degree as the proposed project

Legend:
L = Less impacts than the proposed project; reduces or eliminates significant and adverse impacts
S = Similar impacts as the proposed project; does not eliminate significant and adverse impacts
G = Greater impacts than the proposed project

With regard to the remaining alternatives, the environmentally superior alternative would be Alternative 3, the Reduced Project/Historic Resource Avoidance Alternative. This Alternative would avoid significant project and cumulative impacts related to the loss of historic resources in the City because it would not require demolition of the historic structure located at 9080 Santa Monica Boulevard. Additionally, the Reduced Project/Historic Resource Avoidance Alternative would avoid a significant adverse impact at the intersection of Foothill Road/Santa Monica Boulevard in the existing plus alternative scenario, and would also avoid adverse cumulative impacts at the intersections of Doheny Drive/Santa Monica Boulevard and Doheny Drive/Beverly Boulevard.

Alternative 3, the Reduced Project/Historic Resource Avoidance Alternative would achieve many of the project objectives but would not utilize the existing parcels to their full extent. Although Alternative 3 would avoid the historic resource located on the project site, the reduction of retail and office uses may not maximize the redevelopment potential of the site or fully enhance the area's overall urban character. In addition, Alternative 3 would not result in a cohesive site design and would not create a unified gateway design for the project site, which is the western gateway to the City of West Hollywood. Consequently, Alternative 3 would not expand the economic base of the City or foster the City's fiscal health to the same degree as the proposed project. In addition, this Alternative would not result in a cohesive site design and would not enhance the intersection of Santa Monica Boulevard/Melrose Avenue/Doheny Drive to create a unified design for the western gateway to the City of West Hollywood. Therefore, this Alternative would meet some of the project objectives, but not to the same degree as the proposed project.

This page intentionally left blank