



## City of Torrance, Planning Department

3031 Torrance Blvd., Torrance, CA 90503 (310) 618-5990

# Environmental Checklist Form

Jeffery W. Gibson, Planning Director

(Revised 7/30/03)

- 1. Project Title:** Maricopa Properties - Montecito Estates
- 2. Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Torrance  
3031 Torrance Boulevard  
Torrance, CA 90503
- 3. Contact Person and Phone Number:** Jane Isomoto, Planning Manager  
(310) 618-5990
- 4. Project Location:** 2829 Maricopa Avenue  
Torrance CA 90503
- 5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address:** Maricopa Properties - Residential project and  
City of Torrance - Zone Change & General Plan  
Amendment
- 6. General Plan Designation:** Light Industrial
- 7. Zoning:** M-2, Heavy Manufacturing and  
P-1, Planting and Parking
- 8. Description of the Project:** The project is a proposal to construct a gated, 104  
unit detached condominium project. The 10-acre  
site is currently developed with a 154,000 square  
foot industrial facility. The project requires  
approval of a Zone Change, a General Plan  
Amendment, a Planned Development Permit, a  
Conditional Use Permit, a Tentative Tract Map and  
Development Agreement.
- 9. Surrounding Land uses and Setting:** The property is located in an established industrial  
subdivision. Properties to the north, east and west  
are zoned M-2 and developed with industrial users  
and a church. The subject property is bordered by  
a 34-foot wide railroad spur line. Properties to the  
south, across Maricopa Avenue are developed as a  
low-density, single family residential neighborhood.
- 10. Other public agencies whose approval  
is required:** None

**ENVIROMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

**DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation:**

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

Field Inspections and Assessment By:

/ s / Gregg Lodan

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

July 30, 2003

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

CONCUR:

/ s / Jane Isomoto

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jane Isomoto, Planning Manager  
Secretary to the Planning Commission

July 30, 2003

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant		
		Impact	With	Impact	Impact
			Mitigation		
			Incorporation		

**1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:**

(a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The proposed Project would not introduce incompatible visual elements within a field of view containing a scenic vista or substantially block a scenic vista. The Project will involve the construction of residential structures that will be consistent with the visual character of the neighboring residential development. The proposed Project therefore will not affect any scenic vistas.*

*No scenic resources would be affected by the Project. The Project site contains no scenic resources, and is not located on or near a designated State or City scenic highway. No historic buildings are found on site. A condition of approval will be proposed which requires the preservation of the mature pine trees along Maricopa Avenue. The applicant has submitted a plan with building and perimeter wall setbacks that allow for the retention of the trees in question. These trees will be enhanced with additional landscaping.*

*The proposed Project would not introduce incompatible visual elements on the Project site or visual elements that would be incompatible with the character of the area surrounding the Project site. The Project site is located between a largely industrial area and a residential neighborhood, which is visually compatible with the Project. The Project would form a visual extension of the residential uses to the south.*

*The proposed Project would not introduce new sources of light or glare on the Project site, which would be incompatible with the surrounding areas or which would pose a safety hazard to motorists utilizing adjacent streets. The Project site and surrounding area contain numerous sources of nighttime lighting, including parking lot and streetlights, architectural and security light and automobile headlights. The proposed Project's exterior lighting will be directed and shielded to minimize light spilling onto surrounding residential properties and vehicular traffic.*

*Glare is a common phenomenon in the Southern California area due mainly to the occurrence of a high number of days per year with direct sunlight and the highly urbanized nature of the region, which results in a large concentration of potentially reflective surfaces. The use of non-reflective surfaces for the exterior finishes of the residential units (including rooftop), in combination with the retention of many existing trees and the provision of additional landscaping will reduce heat and glare impacts to less than significant levels.*

**2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:**

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*The proposed Project would not result in the conversion of state-designated prime agricultural land from agricultural use to a non-agricultural use. The Project is located on a property developed with an industrial use, and there are no agricultural activities on the site. The Project site is not agriculturally zoned. Therefore, the Project will not affect agricultural resources.*

**3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:**

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| (c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative threshold for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant		
		Impact	Mitigation	Impact	Impact

An Air Quality Assessment was prepared for the proposed development by RBF Consulting (June 4, 2003). The technical report analyzed the potential short and long-term air quality impacts resulting from the proposed development. The technical report concludes that the Project would be consistent with the Southern California Association of Government Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide and the South Coast Air Quality Management District Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP). With respect to the AQMP, the report concludes that “[s]ince the AQMP is based on the City’s General Plan assumptions, and since the proposed project would not exceed the General Plan EIR emission assumptions for the site, the project would be considered consistent with the AQMP land use assumptions and goals.”

The technical report concludes that construction related activities are temporary and would last the duration of the construction of the Project. Short-term impacts would include dust from demolition, clearing and grading activities and exhaust from vehicles and equipment used during this period. These impacts have been analyzed in the air quality technical report and determined to be less than significant. These short-term impacts are mitigated by the City’s Building Code, which requires the periodic sprinkling of graded areas with water, and by street sweeping in the vicinity of the Project. The air quality technical report also identifies other techniques by which impacts may be reduced including the suspension of grading operations during windy periods or first and second stage smog alerts; the installation of landscaping as soon as possible to reduce wind erosion; limiting the use of generators; and proper maintenance of equipment. Long-term impacts are also further reduced below a level of significance by utilizing energy efficient lighting and drought tolerant landscaping. The report therefore concludes that the Project would not violate any air quality standard.

The technical report also concludes that implementation of the Project would not result in localized concentrations of carbon monoxide (CO). The Project would therefore not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

The Mobil Oil facility located north of the site is considered an existing stationary source of toxic pollutants. According to the South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the siting of sensitive receptors within one-quarter mile of an existing facility would require a health risk assessment as part of the environmental analysis. Given the Project’s distance from the facility (i.e. greater than the 1/4-mile threshold), a health risk assessment is not required for this Project. Further, the potential for noxious gases to present an environmental concern to future on-site residents is considered to be less than significant.

The General Plan Update Final EIR, 1992, analyzed the long-term cumulative impacts in the City anticipated as a result of the development contemplated pursuant to the Torrance General Plan. The General Plan Update Final EIR concluded that impacts on air quality were significant and could not be mitigated to a level of insignificance. The City therefore adopted a statement of overriding consideration concerning air quality. As the Project is expected to have less impact than the industrial uses analyzed in the General Plan EIR, cumulative impacts related to this project are considered to be previously assessed and less than significant.

For these reasons, the impact of the Project with regard to air quality is considered to be less than significant.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:**

- (a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulation, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?
 

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*The Conservation Element of the Torrance General Plan and the General Plan EIR do not identify any threatened or endangered species in the City of Torrance. The Project site has been developed with industrial uses and parking for decades. It is entirely surrounded by other urban development of various types of uses with no significant stretches of open space and no areas of significant biological resource value. The Project site is not located in an environmentally sensitive area and does not function as part of a wildlife corridor. No riparian, wetland or other sensitive natural community identified in local plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the United States Fish and Wildlife Service occur on the Project site. The Project does not conflict with any conservation or preservation plans. For these reasons, the Project has a less than significant impact on biological resources.*

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:**

(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

*There is no evidence in the General Plan or General Plan EIR that there are any known historical, archaeological, paleontological or geological resources on the site or in the immediate vicinity that might be indirectly affected by the development. There are no known human remains on the site. For these reasons, the Project will not significantly affect Cultural Resources.*

**6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:**

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant		
		Impact	Mitigation	Impact	Impact

The City of Torrance is located in a seismically active area. However, the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation for the Project prepared by NorCal Engineering (March 31, 2003) indicates that there are no known active or potentially active faults trending toward or through the Project site. The proposed development lies outside of any Alquist Priolo Special Studies Zone and the potential for damage due to direct fault rupture is considered very remote. With respect to liquefaction, the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation found that the Project site is not situated in an area of historic occurrence of liquefaction, or local geological, geotechnical or groundwater conditions to indicate a potential for permanent ground displacement.

The Uniform Building Code (UBC) provides the only available mitigation in that it sets procedures and limitations for the design of structures based on seismic risk and the type of facility. All proposed construction will be subject to all applicable provisions of the UBC, which is expected to provide mitigation for ground shaking hazards that are typical in Southern California.

The Project site is not known to contain expansive soils or instable soils. With respect to landslides, the site is relatively level, not located on or proximate to a hillside, and has been previously graded and paved. Proposed development will not disturb any hillsides.

With respect to soil erosion, grading during construction would expose soils for a limited time, allowing for possible erosion, although the amounts would not be expected to be substantial. In addition, the area surrounding the Project site is completely developed and there are no adjacent or nearby areas that may be susceptible to indirect erosional processes (e.g. uncontrolled runoff) caused by the Project. Construction of the Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. Most of the site would be covered with the proposed residential units, while the remaining portions of the site will either be covered with impermeable surfaces (e.g. walkways, driveways, and hardscape) or with irrigated landscaping. No exposed areas subject to erosion would be created or affected by the proposed Project. Further, the property will be subject to the requirements of the Torrance Municipal Code with regard to soil compaction and drainage. Erosion will be controlled by standard erosion control measures imposed in conjunction with the issuance of a grading permit.

The Project site has sewer access and does not rely on any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

**7. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:**

- |     |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | Create significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (c) | Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) | Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant	Significant	Impact
		Impact	With	Impact	Impact
			Mitigation		
			Incorporation		

- |     |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (e) | For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (f) | For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (g) | Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (h) | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*The proposed development of a 104 detached unit residential project in this location will not involve hazardous materials beyond that of a typical residential area. The development may reduce potential impacts from hazardous materials, as a property that is currently used for industrial purposes would be converted to residential use. The site is not designated on any hazardous materials sites list. The property is not located within the two-mile vicinity of a public airport or private airstrip or within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.*

*A Phase II Subsurface Investigation Report was prepared for the site by URS (June 4, 2003), which identified that hazardous materials associated with the prior industrial uses of the site are shallow and localized and do not require removal, or have been previously successfully remediated. Specifically, the Phase II report found that all soil samples collected indicated that concentrations of subsurface constituents were below the Residential Preliminary Remediation Goals of the United States Environmental Protection Agency. In addition, based on soil conditions encountered, reported depth to groundwater and the expected regional geology, the Phase II report concluded that there is no apparent threat to groundwater below the Project site. The Phase II report therefore recommends no further action for the Project site with respect to future residential development.*

*Although temporary, partial street closures may be necessary for some construction activities, the proposed Project would not substantially impede public access or travel upon public rights-of-way and would not interfere with any adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Project impacts to area traffic, nearby roadways, and intersections would be less than significant (see Section 15 below).*

*The Project is located in an urbanized area that does not contain expanses of wildland area and therefore does not pose potential fire hazard involving wildland fires.*

#### 8. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

- |     |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (b) | Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

(c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant		
		Impact	Mitigation	Impact	Impact

Drainage and surface runoff related to short-term construction activities will be controlled pursuant to the provisions of the Grading Permit. Soil absorption rates will not be altered significantly as the site is currently developed with an industrial building and large paved parking areas. The requirements of the Torrance Municipal Code and the Uniform Building Code will direct drainage and surface runoff to the storm drain system and the Project will be subject to the requirements of the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan. As a prerequisite to obtaining a Grading Permit, an Erosion Control Plan providing Best Management Practices (BMP's) to control the discharge of storm water pollutants, including sediments, associated with the construction activities will have to be submitted to and approved by the Grading Division of the Building and Safety Department in accordance with the National Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMPS) regulations.

The water quality of the runoff from the proposed Project is expected to be comparable to that typically generated by residential developments, and would not be expected to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. First, because the existing Project site is almost entirely covered with an impermeable paving, development of the Project would not increase the amount of runoff from the site. Second, no activities would be conducted at the proposed Project that might lead to the violation of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Furthermore, the Project will replace industrial uses, which sometimes require discharge permits.

Since virtually the entire Project site is currently covered with impermeable surfaces, the amount of groundwater recharge on the site is negligible. Additionally, the Project does not involve deep excavation, and the need for site dewatering is not contemplated. The Project is not located near any surface waters and is not located in an area subject to flooding. The Project will be serviced by the City's storm drain system, which has sufficient capacity to accommodate the proposed construction. Pursuant to the Torrance Municipal Code and the NPDES program, all wastewaters and surface waters will be directed to the appropriate system. Therefore, there will be no significant environmental impacts with regards to bodies of water or groundwater systems.

The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage patterns of the Project site. Runoff from the Project would be collected and directed toward existing storm drains in the Project vicinity. The Project therefore is not expected to result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site.

The Project site is not in an area designated as a 100-year flood hazard area and therefore would not have any risk of flooding or conflict with the possibility of flood flows.

**9. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:**

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant		
		Impact	Mitigation	Impact	Impact

The Project Site is located along the southern edge of an area identified as the Central Manufacturing District by the City's General Plan. It is bounded by Maricopa Avenue to the south, a public street-width railroad spur to the north, Hawaii Avenue to the west and an industrial property immediately to the east. To the south of Maricopa Avenue is a traditional single-family tract community on standard size lots. The Project Site is approximately 10 acres and has approximately 1,000 feet of frontage along Maricopa Avenue. There is a 154,000 square-foot industrial building used for warehouse facilities by two tenants, Hitachi and Harvest Fire. The Project contemplates the removal of this building and development of up to 104 detached residential units.

The Project Site is designated as "Light Industrial" in the City's General Plan. This designation is characterized by a wide variety of industrial uses, including manufacturing of finished parts and products from prepared materials or component parts. It also includes warehouse/distribution, research and development and other industrial uses. Manufacture and assembly are primarily limited to enclosed buildings. While this designation does not preclude the existence of isolated heavy industrial uses, the General Plan promotes the recycling of existing uses toward light industrial uses. The industrial area to the north and partially to the east of the Project Site is developed with a mix of light industrial uses and serves as a transitional area between the residential area to the south of Maricopa Avenue and the heavy industrial uses further to the north.

The proposal for a residential use in this location, adjacent to industrial uses to the north and east, must be reviewed against a number of land use policies in the General Plan. The Project also provides an opportunity to address the City's housing needs, and to provide transitional zoning and a buffer for the residential uses to the south of Maricopa Avenue.

While the Project would locate residential uses in a partially industrial area, the Project would not physically divide an established community. The Project Site is already divided from much of the surrounding industrial properties by the 34-foot railroad spur to the north and Hawaii Avenue to the west, which serve as natural buffers and define the Project Site as a separate area from much of the southern portion of the Central Manufacturing District. The Project represents an extension of the residential uses located immediately to the south of Maricopa Avenue and provides a transitional buffer for those uses. Meanwhile, the demand for residential properties and the need for housing have increased. The 1992 General Plan acknowledged the limitations on the availability of land and cyclical changes in the demand for certain types of land in part by re-designating marginal commercial and industrial lands for residential purposes. Moreover, since the Project Site has been without a significant industrial tenant for over 6 years, the Project Site has not been a contributing factor to the industrial sector of the Central Manufacturing District. By re-designating the Project Site as Low-Medium Density Residential, the General Plan will accurately reflect the site as a marginal industrial property, which may be considered part of the residential community to the south of Maricopa Avenue rather than the industrial properties to the north and east. In addition, through the incorporation of Project design features and mitigation measures that will provide buffers between the Project Site and nearby industrial uses, the Project will not undermine the continued viability of the surrounding area for industrial purposes. The Project will therefore not divide an established community and impacts will remain less than significant.

The Project Site is subject to the land use plans, policies and regulations of the City of Torrance, including applicable sections of the City of Torrance General Plan and Municipal Code. Regional agencies, including the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) also have policies and requirements addressing planning and land use issues that affect the Project. Please see the attached discussion which analyses the project in relationship to these requirements.

**10. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:**

- (a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?
- (b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

*There are no known mineral resources in the vicinity; therefore, the proposed development will not negatively impact Mineral Resources.*

**11. NOISE. Would the project result in:**

(a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially	Less Than	Less than	No
		Significant	Significant		
		Impact	Mitigation	Impact	Impact
			Incorporation		

A Technical Noise Assessment was prepared for the Project by RBF Consulting (June 4, 2003). The Noise Assessment analyzed the noise impacts of the Project from construction, from stationary noise sources and from mobile noise sources (i.e. traffic noise) generated by the Project, and concluded that the Project would not result in a significant noise impact.

The Project would not result in a significant noise impact during construction, with the incorporation of mitigation measures, including requiring prior approval from the Director of Building and Safety to use heavy construction equipment (e.g. pile drivers, mechanical shovels, derricks, etc.); restricting the use of power construction tools or equipment in outdoor construction adjacent to residential areas to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.; and locating and muffling construction equipment to avoid impacts to sensitive receptors. Since pavement breaking is expected to be minimal during construction, the Project would not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

Vehicular trips generated by the Project are expected to result in a minimal increase of 0.31 dBA along Maricopa Street, which will result in less than significant impacts to existing and future residential uses. This 0.31dBA contribution is considered to be less than significant as sound levels less than 1 dBA are only detectable under laboratory conditions. In addition, the Project proposes certain noise attenuation features, such as setbacks, double pane windows and sound walls to further reduce less than significant impacts.

The light industrial uses located within the vicinity of the Project site generate noise levels that are within those permitted by the City's Noise Ordinance. These uses are permitted to operate multiple shifts, including overnight and on weekends. There is the potential that existing or future industrial uses in the vicinity could negatively impact the proposed homes with regards to noise issues. For this reason, staff is including Mitigation Measures requiring the use of double paned windows with an STC rating of 32, entry doors with a 1-3/4" solid core, with vinyl weather stripping and prohibiting the use of mail slots. Furthermore, ventilation openings in the exterior walls will be required to have acoustical baffles; mechanical ventilation will be required by forced air units providing a minimum of 15 cfm of outside air intake. Through the incorporation of these mitigation measures and other design techniques, such as setbacks, and enhanced landscaping, impacts from adjacent stationary sources will be further reduced. Construction of the proposed residential units also will be required to comply with Building Code Title 24 to ensure that interior noise levels do not exceed 45 dBA CNEL. The Project is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

**12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:**

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

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

While the proposed Project consists of 104 detached residential units, the Project will not significantly induce population growth of the City of Torrance. As identified in the Housing Element for the City of Torrance, there is currently a jobs/housing imbalance. The General Plan Update Final EIR assessed the cumulative environmental impacts of 4,270 additional residential units being developed in the City over a period of 20 years. Approximately 1,600 housing units have been developed over the past ten years. Therefore, the population and housing growth due to the Project are well within the established growth parameters of the City's General Plan. The proposed development will provide much needed stock of new residential units. As the property is currently developed industrially, the Project will not displace housing units or residents. Temporary construction jobs generated by the Project also will not significantly induce population growth in the City, since these employees typically do not relocate closer to a construction site, as the length of time spent at a specific job site is limited.

**13. PUBLIC SERVICES**

(a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered government facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(v) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
			With Mitigation Incorporation		

The Project represents the conversion of a property used for industrial purposes to residential uses. There are adequate fire, police and public services provided by the City of Torrance to service the proposed development. The Torrance Fire Department has indicated that the construction of a residential project in this location will not significantly impact response times. The Project will be served primarily by Fire Station 1 (Department Headquarters), with 17 firefighters per shift. Furthermore, the Fire Department has recently instituted a Computer Aided Dispatch system, which identifies and sends the closest available units to respond to calls for service. The Fire Department has also indicated that there is adequate fire flow to service the Project. Therefore, the Project has a less than significant impact on fire protection.

The City of Torrance Police Department serves the Project site. The Police Department headquarters is located within ¼ mile west of the site. The Project represents a negligible increase in the resident population of the City. Although service calls for police assistance may increase slightly over the existing uses due to the full time residential nature of the Project, it is not expected to result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered facilities. Therefore, the project has a less than significant impact on police protection.

The Superintendent of the Torrance Unified School District concluded that the District has the ability to accommodate the school age population that would be generated by the proposed development. Official estimates conclude that 30 to 35 additional students from grades K to 12 would be associated with the proposed development. These students would be accommodated in three schools: Fern Elementary, Madrona Middle School and Torrance High School. These increases are compensated for by an assessment fee, which is calculated at the rate of \$2.14 per square foot of habitable floor area. Total fees will be calculated based on the final construction drawings submitted for plan check. The school district has approximately 25,000 students with 6% to 7% of students coming from outside the district. The impact of this development on the local schools is considered to be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed Project will not have a significant environmental impact with regard to public services.

**14. RECREATION:**

- (a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?
- (b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

The subject property was not used recreationally. While the Project will increase the demand for recreational services, the Project includes areas dedicated to a pool area, landscaped areas and a tot lot, which may be utilized by the residents. The subject site is located within close proximity to several recreational facilities within the City of Torrance including Columbia Park, Charles Wilson Park, and the Civic Center Complex, which includes a main library, swimming pool, cultural arts facility and Japanese garden. The addition of 104 residential units in this location is not expected to significantly impact the ability of the existing facilities to accommodate the residents. Therefore, this Project will not significantly impact recreational facilities.

**15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:**

- (a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

either the number or vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- |     |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|-----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (b) | Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| (c) | Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (d) | Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (e) | Result in inadequate emergency access?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (f) | Result in inadequate parking capacity?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| (g) | Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

*Linscott Law & Greenspan prepared a Traffic Impact Analysis Report (June 2, 2003) analyzing the proposed Project. The study analyzed 15 intersections in the vicinity of the Project. Two of the intersections currently operate at unacceptable service levels during the a.m. and/or p.m. peak hour based on the City's Level of Service (LOS) standards. These two intersections are Crenshaw Boulevard and Torrance Boulevard and Crenshaw Boulevard and Carson Street. The remaining 13 intersections currently operate at LOS D or better during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, with the local stop-controlled intersections along Maricopa Avenue operating at LOS A during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. On a typical weekday, the proposed development is expected to generate 1,000 daily trips, with 78 trips (20 inbound, 58 outbound) produced in the a.m. peak hour and 105 trips (68 inbound and 37 outbound) produced in the p.m. peak hour. The results of the traffic analysis show that the proposed development will have a less than significant traffic impact.*

*The Project will provide the code-required amount of parking for each unit as well as guest parking spaces for the development. The Project has been designed to provide adequate emergency access with the use of appropriate street widths, turning radius, vertical clearances and street grades. Furthermore, the Project will include an emergency access gate on Maricopa Avenue and the provision of a rapid entry system for emergency personnel.*

*The traffic technical report also analyzed potential impacts of the Project on surrounding residential streets, including Maricopa Street, Kornblum Avenue, Hickory Avenue and Torrance Frontage Road, and concluded that the Project would not have a significant traffic intrusion impact on the adjacent residential neighborhood.*

*For these reasons, the Project will not have an adverse impact on Transportation and Traffic in the area.*

**16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:**

- |     |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| (a) | Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Utilities and infrastructure systems are available to support the proposed Project without the need for either new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to existing facilities. The Project will comply with City of Torrance recycling program requirements. Sufficient water supplies exist to serve the project. The Project is not expected to exceed the capacity of the wastewater treatment facilities or landfills. Given the nature and extent of the Project, it will not have a significant environmental impact on utilities and service systems, including water, electricity, wastewater, stormwater and solid waste.*

**17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

(a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
-----------------------	---------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

*The proposed Project is located in a developed urban area. The proposed Project would have less than significant impacts with respect to biological resources and cultural resources. As the Project is proposed on a site currently developed with an industrial building with surface parking, there is no evidence that the Project will result in any adverse impact on fish and wildlife resources and their habitats or plant material.*

(b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

                                                                

*Although there are past, current and probable future projects in the area surrounding the Project site, the Project’s incremental contribution to cumulative traffic, air quality, and other impact areas as mitigated are less than significant. Therefore, the Project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would not be considered cumulatively considerable.*

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

                                                                

*As the environmental impacts of this Project as mitigated herein are determined to be less than significant overall, there is no evidence to indicate that adverse impacts will be caused to human beings, either directly or indirectly.*

**18. EARLIER ANALYSIS:**

a) The General Plan Update Final EIR, 1992, is a program EIR pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. Pursuant to CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, a program EIR may (1) serve as the basis for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects, and (2) be incorporated by reference to deal with regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole. This Initial Study incorporates the analysis contained in the General Plan EIR.

**19. SOURCE REFERENCES:**

1. City of Torrance General Plan Land Use Element and Land Use Map, October 1992
2. General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report, SCH #1990010318, October 1992
3. City of Torrance Municipal Code, Division 9: Planning & Land Use
4. City of Torrance Zoning Map
5. City of Torrance General Plan Safety Element
6. Air Quality Handbook for Environmental Impact Reports – 1993, South Coast Air Quality Management District
7. City of Torrance General Plan Circulation Element
8. City of Torrance General Plan Conservation Element
9. City of Torrance General Plan Parks and Recreation Element
10. Traffic Impact Analysis Report, Linscott Law & Greenspan
11. Air Quality Assessment, RBF Consulting
12. Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, NorCal Engineering
13. Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, AEI Consultants
14. Acoustical Impact Assessment
15. The Maricopa Report, The Everest Group
16. Project Plot Plan, Floor Plan and Elevations

## **20. ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Location and Zoning Map
2. Land Use Analysis

## **LAND USE DISCUSSION**

The Project Site is subject to the land use plans, policies and regulations of the City of Torrance, including applicable sections of the City of Torrance General Plan and Municipal Code. Regional agencies, including the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) also have policies and requirements addressing planning and land use issues that affect the Project.

### **(a) General Plan of the City of Torrance**

The City's General Plan serves as a comprehensive, long-term policy document for future development. The General Plan is composed of eight elements: Land Use, Circulation, Conservation, Open Space, Recreation, Noise, Safety and Housing. The Land Use Element, Noise Element and Housing Element are relevant to evaluating the potential impacts of the Project. The City of Torrance implements the Land Use Element through the City of Torrance Zoning Code (Zoning Code), which regulates uses and the physical size and organization of structures and other spaces.

The General Plan designates the Project Site "Light Industrial." This designation is characterized by a wide variety of industrial uses, including manufacturing of finished parts and products from prepared materials or component parts. It also includes warehouse/distribution, research and development and other industrial uses. Manufacture and assembly are primarily limited to enclosed buildings. While this designation does not preclude the existence of isolated heavy industrial uses, the General Plan promotes the recycling of existing uses toward light industrial uses. This particular industrial area is developed with a mix of light industrial uses and serves as a transitional area between the residential area to the south of Maricopa Avenue and the heavy industrial uses further to the north.

The City has initiated a General Plan amendment in connection with the Project to change the land use designation for the Project Site from Light Industrial to Low-Medium Density Residential. The Low-Medium Density Residential designation is characterized by residential developments with

densities ranging from nine to 18 units per net acre. The Project proposes development of up to 104 detached residential units on a 10-acre site, for a density of approximately 10 units per acre. With the implementation of the General Plan amendment, the Project would be consistent with the land use designation for the Project Site.

The General Plan contains several policies relevant to the Project, including policies related to maintaining the City as a “balanced community,” the promotion and maintenance of the City’s industrial sector, addressing the City’s need for housing, and ensuring the compatibility of adjacent land uses.

The Main Goal of the General Plan is to “[p]rovide opportunity and support for development and continued revitalization of a balanced total community.” As stated in the City’s Strategic Plan, part of this goal is a “residential and commercial/industrial balance that supports the economic needs of the community.” The General Plan identifies maintaining the City’s industrial base as critical to the City’s long-term economic health. However, limitations on the availability of land and cyclical changes in the demand for certain types of land influence the dynamics of balance. Presently, there is a high demand for residential properties and a need for housing in the City. The 1992 General Plan addressed this issue, in part by the re-designation of marginal commercial and industrial lands for residential purposes. The City’s Strategic Plan sets forth the related goal to “recycle and upgrade antiquated industrial, commercial and retail facilities.” The General Plan therefore acknowledges dual, and potentially competing goals, of maintaining industrial lands to provide business opportunities, while providing land for housing to maintain a quality economic base and a live-work community. Since the preparation of the 1992 General Plan, the Project Site has become a marginal industrial property. A report by The Everest Group, Inc. (“Everest Report”) prepared in connection with the proposed Project evaluated the suitability of the Project Site for industrial uses, as well as the current demand in the City and region for industrial properties. With respect to the Project site, the Everest Report concluded:

As a conventional industrial building, the subject property is outdated and functionally obsolete. It does not compare favorably with the features of more recent industrial developments and it does not meet the desires and demands of today’s industrial users who are primarily seeking warehousing and distribution and not manufacturing facilities. Further, for the types of users now occupying the size range of the subject property, closer freeway proximity and easier freeway access put other developments at a decidedly better advantage from a location standpoint. Finally, short of the demolition of the entire facility and the construction of a brand new building incorporating the latest features, it does not appear that the present facility can be economically renovated in its current form to compete effectively in today’s industrial (or for that matter office or research and development) marketplace.

Everest Report at p. 8. The Everest Report further concluded that:

the subject property has no unique or redeeming features which justify either its preservation or renovation in its current form . . . As it presently exists, the subject property most likely will continue to deteriorate and periodically attract only marginal tenants for the bulk of its space.

Everest Report at p. 9. The Project Site also has contributed little in recent years to the City’s economic tax base and has provided minimal employment opportunities. Adoption of a General Plan amendment changing the land use designation for the Project Site from Light Industrial to Low-Medium Density Residential both acknowledges the diminished value of the Project Site for

industrial purposes and the need for increased housing opportunities within the City. The Project is therefore consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan to promote a total balanced community.

With respect to the preservation and maintenance of the City's industrial sector, Policies 2.1 and 2.3 of the General Plan Land Use Element require the City to "promote commercial and industrial land use decisions that maintain the City's economic health and fiscal responsibility" and to "maintain a strong industrial sector which includes a variety of industry types to provide jobs and revenue to the City." Although removal of viable industrial property could threaten the City's ability to attract businesses, maintain its job base and provide for higher wage employment, removal of marginal, functionally obsolete industrial property from the Central Manufacturing District, such as the Project Site, will not result in significant land use impacts to the immediate area or undermine the viability of the City's industrial sector.

The Project Site is not currently a significant contributor to the City's industrial sector. In particular, the Everest Report notes that:

if the subject property remained 'as is' with its present features, the property is already effectively removed from the industrial base inventory for all practical purposes. Demolishing the improvements and converting the property to residential use would therefore have no impact on either current or historical demand since the subject property in its present form is not a likely candidate for use by today's industrial occupants regardless.

Everest Report at p. 9. In addition, the existing square footage on the Project Site makes up only 0.5% percent of the approximately 30,669,00 square feet of industrial space in the City. Everest Report at p. 5. The Everest Report also observes that, of the 4.2 million square feet of industrial property that has been constructed in the City over the past five years, over 3.7 million square feet consist of buildings in excess of 100,000 square feet, which is similar to the size of the buildings on the Project Site. Everest Report at p. 7. Therefore, there appears to be a sufficient number of industrial properties of similar size to the Project Site in the City, such that removal of the Project Site from the industrial market would not impact demand for such properties. The Everest Report observes that, given that the Project Site has been without a significant industrial tenant and has under-performed as an industrial property for the past several years, the City has already effectively sustained the loss of the Project Site from its industrial sector. The Everest Report therefore concludes that the historical and current demand in the City for industrial property "will be satisfied without the existence of the subject property as part of both the South Bay regional marketplace and the Torrance submarket." Everest Report at p. 10. The Project therefore is consistent with Policies 2.1 and 2.3, since it is not expected to impact the economic health of the City or to threaten viability of the City's industrial sector.

With respect to the promotion of housing opportunities, Program 9.4.1 of the General Plan Land Use Element requires the City to explore "innovative approaches to residential development that decrease the cost of housing and increase the opportunity for home ownership." Policy 9.7 of the Land Use Element requires the City to "support the concept of housing which is close to employment and commercial centers." According to the City's General Plan Housing Element, the City has only approximately 8.5 acres of vacant residentially zoned land, approximately 2.1 acres of which are currently zoned for multi-family dwelling units. The General Plan Environmental Impact Report anticipated the addition of 4,270 housing units through 2012. Since 1992, approximately 1,620 units have been constructed. The Project proposes an innovative approach to residential development and fulfilling the City's housing needs through infill development of a marginal

industrial site, adjacent to existing residential uses, transit, employment centers and commercial uses. The Project is therefore consistent with the General Plan’s goal and policies related to housing.

With respect to land use compatibility, Policy 3.2 of the General Plan Land Use Element requires the City to “encourage land use compatibility by which both industrial lands and neighboring properties are protected.” Policy 3.4 requires the City to “consider both the impact of a proposed development on neighboring property and the impact of existing uses, especially heavy industrial uses, on new development.” Program 3.4.1 requires the City to “[e]stablish buffers where possible between heavy industrial uses and any immediately adjacent residential, commercial or mixed use business / industrial uses,” whereas Program 3.4.3 requires the City to “[e]stablish transitional zones between industrial and residential zones where possible.”

Residential and industrial uses are not traditionally compatible land uses. However, where adequate buffers exist and effective mitigation measures are incorporated, impacts to land use compatibility can be reduced to less than significant levels. The Project Site currently contains natural buffers from surrounding industrial uses, namely Hawaii Avenue to the west and the public street-width railroad spur (34 feet wide) to the north. Residential uses are located to the south of Maricopa Avenue. Mitigation measures and design features also have been recommended to provide a buffer between the existing industrial uses and the proposed residential uses, which will further encourage land use compatibility. These mitigation measures and design features include among others, double pane glass on windows, a sound wall, and a perimeter wall along the Project Site. Noise impacts and the effectiveness of these mitigation measures to reduce such impacts to less than significant levels are analyzed in Section XI. Since the Project would be denser than the single-family homes to the south of Maricopa Avenue, the Project would also provide a transitional buffer between these residential uses and the industrial uses to the north. While the potential for significant impacts to land use compatibility exists, with the incorporation of Project design features, such as setbacks, sound walls and the retention of some existing trees, and the installation of additional perimeter trees and landscaping, those impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level. The Project is therefore consistent with the General Plan’s goals and policies related to land use compatibility.

The table below summarizes the Project’s consistency with applicable General Plan goals, objectives, policies and programs.

**ANALYSIS OF PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH GENERAL PLAN**

<b>Relevant Goal, Objective, Policy or Program</b>	<b>Analysis of Project Consistency</b>
<b>Land Use Element</b>	
Main Goal: Provide opportunity and support for development and continued revitalization of a balanced total community.	The Project will replace marginal and functionally obsolete industrial land with much-need housing to bolster the City’s housing supply, which will result in a more appropriate balance of industrial and residential uses, given the City’s current needs.
Objective 1.0: Consistency between zoning and the land use goals, objectives, policies	With the adoption of the General Plan amendment and zoning map amendment, the zoning for the Project Site will remain consistent with its land use

<b>Relevant Goal, Objective, Policy or Program</b>	<b>Analysis of Project Consistency</b>
and programs of the General Plan.	designation.
Program 1.2.2: Revise the zoning ordinance as needed to reflect the Goals, Objectives, Policies and Programs stated in the Land Use Element.	The Project will result in amendments to the Zoning Code to permit residential uses on the Project Site, consistent with the Objectives, Policies and Programs of the Land Use Element related to housing, including Objective 9.0, Policy 9.1, Policy 9.4, Program 9.4.1 and Policy 9.7.
Objective 2.0: Continued viability of the City's commercial and industrial economic base.	By recycling marginal, functionally obsolete industrial land, which has already effectively been removed from the City's industrial sector due to its inability to attract a significant industrial tenant, and by providing adequate buffers between the proposed residential uses and existing nearby industrial uses, the Project will not significantly impact the continued viability of the City's industrial economic base.
Policy 2.1: The City shall promote commercial and industrial land use decisions that maintain the City's economic health and fiscal responsibility.	Since the Project Site is functionally obsolete as an industrial property, it has been unable to attract a significant industrial tenant and maximize its contribution to the City's tax and employment base. The Project Site is currently generating minimal tax revenue for the City.
Policy 2.3: The City shall maintain a strong industrial sector, which includes a variety of industry types to provide jobs and revenue to the City.	The Project Site is currently not contributing significantly to the City's industrial sector and is providing minimal jobs and revenue to the City. The improvements on the Project Site are outdated and functionally obsolete for industrial uses. There is a sufficient amount of existing and planned industrial properties in the City to accommodate industrial demand. Use of the Project Site for residential uses therefore will not significantly impact the City's industrial sector.
Objective 3.0: Promote compatibility between land uses.	The Project will provide a transitional buffer between the existing single-family residences south of Maricopa Avenue and the industrial uses north of Maricopa Avenue. Project features have been incorporated, which will promote compatibility between the residential and industrial uses, including among others setbacks, sound walls and perimeter trees.
Program 3.1.2: Encourage the provision of sound barriers between noise sources and	The Project incorporates features, which will provide a sound barrier between the nearby industrial uses and the proposed residential uses. These barriers

<b>Relevant Goal, Objective, Policy or Program</b>	<b>Analysis of Project Consistency</b>
residential neighborhoods.	include setbacks, sound walls and perimeter trees.
Policy 3.2: The City shall encourage land use compatibility by which both industrial lands and neighboring properties are protected.	Hawaii Avenue to the west and the 34-foot railroad spur to the north currently provide natural buffers between the existing industrial uses and the proposed residential use. Project features have also been incorporated to provide a buffer between the existing industrial uses and the proposed residential uses, which will further encourage land use compatibility.
Policy 3.4: The City shall consider both the impact of a proposed development on neighboring property and the impact of existing uses, especially heavy industrial uses, on new development.	Through the imposition of recommended mitigation measures, the Project will reduce the impacts of the Project on neighboring industrial properties and the impacts of those properties on the Project.
Program 3.4.1: Establish buffers where possible between heavy industrial uses and any immediately adjacent residential, commercial or mixed-use business / industrial uses.	The surrounding industrial uses represent light, rather than heavy, industrial uses. However, the Project will nonetheless establish a buffer between these industrial uses and the single-family homes to the south of Maricopa Avenue. Moreover, project features have been incorporated, including setbacks, sound walls and perimeter trees, which will provide buffering for the Project.
Program 3.4.3: Establish transitional zones between industrial and residential zones where possible.	The City has initiated a zone change in connection with the Project to change the existing zoning for the Project Site to the P-D zone, which will allow for a more dense residential development than the single family homes located to the south of Maricopa Avenue. Through this zone change and by providing up to 104 single family homes on an approximately 10-acre site, the Project will establish a transitional zone between the existing residential uses south of Maricopa Avenue and the industrial uses to the north.
Objective 9.0: The provision of housing consistent with the goals and policies contained in the Housing Element.	By providing up to 104 detached residential homes, the Project will bolster the City's housing supply, consistent with the goals and policies of the Housing Element.
Policy 9.1: The City shall maintain low density residential as the predominant residential	The proposed General Plan amendment will change the land use designation to Low-Medium Density Residential, and the proposed density of the Project (approximately 10 units per acre) is consistent with

<b>Relevant Goal, Objective, Policy or Program</b>	<b>Analysis of Project Consistency</b>
land use in the City.	this designation.
Policy 9.4: The City shall promote a stable residential community with a high degree of owner-occupied homes.	The Project promotes a stable residential community and home ownership by proposing up to 104 detached residential homes.
Program 9.4.1: Explore innovative approaches to residential development that decrease the cost of housing and increase the opportunity for home ownership.	The Project proposes an innovative approach to residential development through infill development of marginal industrial site. By locating residential uses nearby existing infrastructure, transit and commercial uses, the Project will decrease the cost of housing and increase the opportunity for home ownership.
Policy 9.7: The City shall support the concept of housing, which is close to employment and commercial centers.	By locating the Project at the southern edge of the Central Manufacturing District, the Project supports the concept of locating housing near employment and commercial centers.
<b>Noise Element</b>	
Policy 2.8: The City shall make appropriate efforts to maintain noise-compatible adjacent land uses.	Refer to Section XI of MND and Technical Noise Assessment. Project features have been incorporated, which will provide a sound barrier between the nearby industrial uses and the proposed residential uses. These barriers include the use of double pane windows, setbacks, sound walls and perimeter trees.

### **Zoning Code of the City of Torrance**

The City of Torrance Zoning Code regulates development through land use designations and development standards. The Project Site is currently zoned M-2 and P1. Section 91.31.1 of the Zoning Code permits a variety of manufacturing uses, such as assembly plants, lumberyards, storage facilities, and welding, and certain commercial uses in the M-2 zone. Section 91.35.1 of the Zoning Code permits landscaping, parks and recreation and off-street parking by Conditional Use Permit in the P1 zone. The Project proposes residential uses, which are not permitted in the M2 or P1 zones. The City has initiated a zone change for the Project Site to the P-D zone. The P-D zone permits any use allowed under the General Plan and approved by the City as part of a Development Plan. Upon the City’s approval of the zone change and the Planned Development Permit for the Project Site, the Project would be consistent with the Zoning Code.

### **Southern California Association of Governments**

The Project Site is within the planning area of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). SCAG's Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide (RCPG) contains a general overview of

federal, state and regional plans applicable to the southern California region and serves as a comprehensive planning guide for future regional growth. The primary goals of the RCPG are to improve the standard of living, enhance the quality of life, and promote social equity. The RCPG contains policies relative to advancing these goals. The following policies set forth in the Growth Management Chapter are relevant to the Project:

- Encourage local jurisdictions' plans that maximize the use of existing urbanized areas accessible to transit through infill and redevelopment.
- Encourage patterns of land use development that reduce infrastructure costs and make better use of existing facilities; and
- Encourage projects that reduce the number of auto trips and vehicles miles traveled and reduce the need for roadway expansion.

The Project promotes these RCPG policies. The Project maximizes the use of an existing urbanized area accessible to transit by proposing an infill residential development on a lot adjacent to major thoroughfares and nearby transit facilities. By locating the Project in an existing developed area, the Project would reduce infrastructure costs and make better use of the existing facilities. Since the Project is adjacent to major thoroughfares, which can accommodate additional vehicle trips, the Project avoids the need for roadway expansion. Since the Project is located nearby commercial uses and employment opportunities, the Project also would reduce the number of auto trips and vehicles miles traveled. The Project is therefore consistent with the policies of the SCAG RCPG.

### **Metropolitan Transportation Authority**

The Metropolitan Transportation Authority administers the state-mandated Congestion Management Plan (CMP), which is designed to address the community and regional impact of urban congestion. The primary goal of the CMP is to enhance economic vitality and quality of life by reducing traffic congestion. The traffic impacts associated with the Project are analyzed in Section XV, Transportation/Traffic. There are no CMP locations in the vicinity of the Project Site. Therefore, as discussed in Section XV, the Project would not result in any significant impacts to intersections or residential streets in the area. The Project is therefore consistent with the CMP.

### **South Coast Air Quality Management District**

The Project Site is located within the South Coast Air Basin (Basin), making it subject to policies set forth by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD). The SCAQMD, in conjunction with SCAG, is responsible for establishing and implementing air pollution control programs throughout the Basin. The SCAQMD's Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP), amended in 1999, presents strategies for achieving the air quality planning goals set forth in the Federal and California Clean Air Acts, including a comprehensive list of pollution control measures aimed at reducing emissions. Specifically, the AQMP proposes a comprehensive list of pollution control measures aimed at reducing emissions and achieving ambient air quality standards. As discussed in Section III, Air Quality, the Project is consistent with the AQMP.

The Project Site is not subject to any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.